DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 494 JC 000 417

AUTHOR Laanan, Frankie Santos
TITLE Beyond Transfer Shock: Dimensions of Transfer Students' Adjustment.
PUB DATE 2000-04-24
NOTE 62p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Transfer Students; *Community Colleges; Emotional Adjustment; Higher Education; *Honors Curriculum; Relocation; Social Adjustment; State Universities; *Student Adjustment; *Transfer Programs
IDENTIFIERS University of California Los Angeles

ABSTRACT

This study examined the adjustment process of 727 students who transferred to the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) in fall 1994 or fall 1995. The Transfer Students' Questionnaire (TSQ) was organized into three main sections: social demographics, perceptions of the community college experience, and perception of the UCLA experience. The methodology compares the responses of the students who had participated in honors programs at their community colleges (TAP students) with those students who had not participated in one of these programs (non-TAP students). The study found that TAP students tend to be white, younger, come from families with higher parental education attainment and income levels, and have higher degree aspirations than their non-TAP counterparts. At the community college, TAP students had higher GPAs and were more likely to spend their free time engaging in extracurricular activities, while non-TAP students were more likely to spend their free time reading for pleasure or doing independent research. Also at the community college, TAP students were more likely to consult with academic counselors on a regular basis. At the university, TAP students continued to have higher GPAs than non-TAP students. Both groups expressed similar levels of satisfaction with UCLA and showed similar levels of involvement at the university. No statistically significant differences were found between the two groups in terms of psychological, academic, or social adjustment. (Contains 60 references.) (CAK)

Beyond Transfer Shock: Dimensions of Transfer Students' Adjustment

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

New Orleans, Louisiana
April 24, 2000

Contact Information:

Frankie Santos Laanan
Assistant Professor, Community College Leadership
Department of Human Resource Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
345 Education Building, MC-708
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, IL 61820
Phone: (217) 333-0807
e-mail: laanan@uiuc.edu

Twelve hundred campuses strong, American community colleges enroll almost half of the nation's undergraduates and half of all first-time freshmen, offering them a diverse and flexible curriculum, which meets the academic and vocational interests of a large student population (American Association of Community Colleges, 1998; Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Of great importance to these two-year institutions is their role in providing transfer opportunities to students who may wish to continue their postsecondary education beyond the community college level. The "transfer function," as it is known, serves as the critical point of entry toward the baccalaureate for an increasing number of students. A student's likelihood of transferring will vary, depending on institutional and personal characteristics. For example, students can enroll in honors courses during their community college career and participate in a formalized articulation program (Laanan, 1995, 1996, 1998). Further, because community colleges enroll a diverse population (e.g., older or non-traditional college-age, ethnic minorities, and low-income students), the academic experiences of a student uniquely depend upon what a student brings to the college environment.

THE PROBLEM

The academic experience of community college transfer students at the senior institution have been well documented by studies characterizing their adjustment process as "*transfer shock*" (Cejda, 1994; Diaz, 1992; Graham & Hughes, 1994; Hill, 1965; Keeley & House, 1993; Knoell & Medsker, 1965; Nolan & Hall, 1978; Townsend, 1993, 1995). These studies found that transfer students tend to experience a temporary dip in grades during their first or second semester after transferring to a senior institution. The majority of the research in this area focuses on the differences between native and transfer students' academic achievement as measured by the traditional GPA (Best & Gehring, 1993; Graham & Hughes, 1994). A popular paradigm in the research literature, the transfer shock concept only describes the cognitive outcome of transfer students' academic adjustment at the senior institution as measured by GPA. However, the research that examines the factors that contribute to this phenomenon is very limited, as is information about the students' emotional and psychological development at the four-year institution. That is, a student's prior experience at the two-year college may influence or impact a student's ultimate progress or performance in terms of both cognitive and affective outcomes at the senior institution.

Since the trend of the research literature has been to use the transfer shock concept as a guiding framework, little work has been conducted to date to understand and explain the experiences of community college transfer students from the social and psychological perspective. Some writers characterize the transition of moving from one educational environment to a new environment as a form

of culture shock (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). This shock generally involves significant social and psychological relearning in the face of new encounters, new teachers, new opportunities, and new academic, personal, and social demands. For transfer students, coming to a four-year college or university requires numerous adjustments to the new environment and institutional culture, including larger classes and campus size, increased academic rigor, new friends, and a new location.

The purpose of this study is two-fold: (1) to investigate the experiences and performance of community college transfer students at a research university; and (2) to move beyond the "transfer shock" concept by building on previous studies in an effort to establish new methods, concepts, and frameworks to better understand and characterize the complex transfer process of community college transfer students. Therefore, this study attempted to answer the following research questions:

- How do students differ in their community college and UCLA experiences by student status? Specifically, to what extent are there statistically significant differences in terms of academic achievement, level of involvement, quality of effort, general perceptions, academic and social adjustment process, and overall satisfaction between TAP and non-TAP students?

- What social demographics, community college, and UCLA factors predict a positive academic adjustment process for all transfer students? Specifically, does a student's age, prior honors participation at the two-year, and racial/ethnic background predict a successful academic adjustment process? Are the most influential factors academic (e.g., GPA), sociological (e.g., friends, family), psychological (e.g., attitudes, perceptions, self-concept, beliefs), or extra-curricular (e.g., involvement) in nature?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

A more complete understanding of the complexity of the transfer adjustment process is essential and will be useful for community college administrators and program officials to implement programs that facilitate a successful adjustment process. This study can also be beneficial to four-year institutions. Reports published both at the two- and four-year tend to only follow students in terms of their grade point average (GPA), retention, and persistence rates. A study that provides more in-depth information pertaining to a transfer student's experience, including students' level of academic and social involvement, overall satisfaction, and adjustment process will yield valuable information for community colleges and senior institutions. Further, the information from this study could be used to improve the transfer curriculum and honors program, to address the needs of transfer students, and ultimately to facilitate the transfer process.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since its beginning, the community college offered a myriad of curriculum options that distinguished it as a unique educational institution meeting the needs of society. The functions have

traditionally included remediation, vocational-technical, community services, life-long learning, and transfer (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, 1992, 1996). According to Cohen and Brawer (1989), "academic transfer, or collegiate studies were meant to fulfill several institutional purposes: a popularizing function, a democratizing pursuit, and a function of conducting the lower division for the universities" (p. 17). The goals were to popularize two-year colleges as a way to help citizens. The democratizing function was emphasized as community colleges became the initial point of access for many people participating in higher education. Courses for the first two years of general education were soon implemented to help relieve the universities from enrolling an overflow of freshman and sophomore students.

Transfer Opportunities in California Community Colleges

Students can enroll in non-honors courses in the community colleges and complete the IGETC requirements and transfer to a senior institution (e.g., University of California and the California State University). Another option for students is to enroll in an honors program at the community college, while pursuing the prerequisites for transfer. For students who are specifically interested in transferring to the University of California, articulation agreements between community colleges and UC campuses have been formalized in an effort to ease the transfer process for students. An example of this opportunity is the Transfer Alliance Program (TAP).

The Transfer Alliance Program (TAP)

During the early 1980s, efforts were made by the University of California, and the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), in particular, to determine ways to promote effective transfer to the University, and to foster retention and academic success after transfer, particularly for ethnic minority students. In 1985, the Center for Academic Interinstitutional Program (CAIP) at UCLA initiated the Transfer Alliance Program (TAP) in conjunction with the College of Letters and Science and the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (UARS) as a means of strengthening the transfer function and the role of faculty in selected community colleges in the Los Angeles area, most of which enrolled large numbers of students from underrepresented ethnic groups (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1990, p. 36). Later, the specific goals of TAP were articulated by Ackermann (1989a) to include the following: (1) stronger student academic preparation and curriculum planning; (2) focus on achieving the baccalaureate degree after transfer; (3) increased achievement of academic skills needed for success in the major; and (4) faculty participation in all the above. The philosophy underlying the structure of TAP is a set of commitments, constructed between UCLA and selected colleges (Banks & Byock, 1991).

Early documents published by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) described TAP as a program that would publicize the community colleges as a viable route to the baccalaureate degree (1990). Students who otherwise were not admitted to UCLA as freshmen were sent a "Community College Option Letter" informing them that upon successful completion of TAP at a participating community college, they were guaranteed priority admission to the College of Letters and Science at UCLA. Students enrolled in TAP are provided services that link them with UCLA in an effort to introduce and familiarize them with various campus services and facilities. The purpose of TAP was to create a curricular articulation agreement between the California community colleges and UCLA with its emphases on the development of an enriched academic curriculum with faculty leadership, support of the academic senate, and linkages with student services, particularly academic counseling (Banks & Byock, 1991). Currently, 25 California community colleges participate in TAP by offering a core of enriched courses to meet general education requirements as well as prerequisites for majors in the College of Letters and Science.

A report published by the University of California (1995, p. 15-16) described TAP as a program that prepares students at participating community colleges to transfer to UCLA as juniors. Students who participate in this program complete a rigorous academic program at the community college. Specifically, the curriculum for TAP consists of a core of enriched general education courses, which require students to engage in writing, reading, and research projects that are more intensive than those offered in general transfer courses (Banks & Byock, 1991). Generally, TAP courses are limited to 25 students in an effort to enhance the interaction between faculty and students and among the students. TAP students have designated faculty and academic counselors that help them plan academic programs that meet general education, pre-major requirements and the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC). Students who successfully complete the program are given priority consideration for admission to the College of Letters and Science at UCLA (except for the Communication Studies major). Students participating in TAP have opportunities to learn more about UCLA through meetings with UCLA counselors, faculty, and students, including students who transferred to UCLA from the same community college. TAP students may use the UCLA library and participate in cultural and sports events on campus. At each participating TAP college the program is directed by a faculty member and is supported by a team of faculty, a senior administrator, and an academic counselor. The faculty directors and TAP counselors meet regularly with UCLA counterparts to discuss program policy and practice (Banks & Byock, 1991). Although TAP was initiated in 1985, the first cohort of TAP-certified students transferred in fall 1988. **Table 1** depicts the enrollments of TAP students by year and quarter and all CCC transfers who entered UCLA from 1988 to 1995. Similarly, **Table 2** shows the number of TAP

students and CCC transfers by racial/ethnic background from 1989 to 1995. The percent distribution by racial/ethnic background is illustrated in **Table 3**.

According to a study conducted by Banks and Byock (1991), TAP students are recruited in three ways. First, students who are denied admission to UCLA as a freshman receive a letter from the UCLA Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (UARS) informing the student of the TAP opportunity at a participating community college. Second, a student who achieves a 3.0 GPA or better during his/her first semester at the community college, has the desire to transfer, and completes or is eligible for collegiate-level English composition, is encouraged by faculty and counselors to join the TAP program. Third, the TAP program is described to high school students at college night programs and during special presentations to encourage all students to consider the community college as a viable option within higher education.

In a study examining the effects of the TAP on its colleges, faculty, and students, Banks and Byock (1991) discussed the socializing aspect of the TAP. Specifically, the socialization process can be understood by the three-way interplay between the program, the faculty, and students. As a result, these different socializing processes tend to have an effect on the "talent development" of both students and faculty. Since the common goal of the TAP provides a focus and purpose for faculty and students to work together toward achieving that goal, a unique environment and interaction is developed. In their interviews, TAP students referred to the program as having "more serious" students and students who had a "commitment" to transferring to a senior institution. Earlier evidence suggests that TAP students from the start are encouraged by TAP faculty and counselors to become involved in campus committees and clubs as well as partake in UCLA and other four-year colleges' sponsored events. Banks and Byock (1991) assert that TAP students who take advantage of these activities tend to be the same students who have high integration into the academic community and who will tend to develop a greater goal orientation as a result of their association.

Research on Community College Honors Programs

A computer-generated literature search of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges was conducted on honors programs at two-year institutions. From 1982 to the present, there were over 45 hits on this topic. The documents cataloged in ERIC can be organized into five general themes: (1) philosophy of honors programs; (2) program development/administration; (3) evaluation and program reviews; (4) honors curriculum; and (5) student performance and characteristics.

Philosophy of Honors Programs. Historically, honors programs in community colleges have not been a major part of the curriculum due to the colleges' focus on providing access to nontraditional and

lower achieving students. A major criticism about honors programs is the notion that such programs are inherently elitist in nature (ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, 1984) and that such attitudes are antithetical to the community college mission (Bulakowski & Townsend, 1995). Olivas (1975) notes, for example, that uneasiness about elitism may be responsible, at least in part, for the lack of research on community college honors curricula (p. 1). He also observed that "the development of honors opportunities for gifted students in two-year colleges is a ... fledgling attempt to educate one constituency in an extremely heterogeneous student population" (p. 12). Olivas also found that only 47 of the 644 responding institutions had formalized academic and administrative programs. However, the vast majority had elements of an honors program for students who demonstrated superior academic ability, including honors classes, guest speakers, credit by examination, achievement-based financial aid, honor rolls, honor societies, and honors advisory committees.

Program Development/Administration. Drawing from a literature review and survey of community colleges with honors programs, Heck (1986) presents a series of recommended strategies and tactics for the establishment and continuation of community college honors programs. Using qualitative methodologies, the author sampled 80 community colleges in Florida and other selected states to determine that the strategies and tactics employed in the implementation and continuation of well-established honors programs did or did not follow the five stages that Martorana and Kuhns identified as phases in the life cycle of academic innovation (i.e., exploration, formulation, trial, refinement, and institutionalization). Similarly, Todd (1988) maintained that administrative organization, clerical needs, selection of qualified faculty, student eligibility requirements, program evaluation, and funding were important elements that needed to be addressed for the improvement and strategic planning of honors programs in community colleges.

Wilbur (1996) conducted a qualitative case study to examine the Transfer Alliance Program and the implementation of a transfer program that required intense collaboration. The study examined the process by which an urban university and several community colleges, linked by history and legislative mandate but distinct in mission and culture, came together to implement a transfer program. The author found that several factors led to the success of the collaborative effort: a significant demand, or motive, for collaboration; the capacity to create interdependence among participating institutions; the ability to overcome initial barriers through negotiation, and the development of shared leadership and trust.

Evaluation and Program Reviews. Several studies were conducted to evaluate honors programs in community colleges. A study conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges (Friedlander, 1982, 1983) interviewed honors program administrators from community college districts in Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, Maricopa County, Miami-Dade, and St. Louis. The main objectives of the

study were to determine: (1) the prevalence of honors programs in the districts; (2) reasons for initiating the programs; (3) types of honors programs and activities in use; (4) admissions criteria for honors programs; (5) scholarship information; (6) the extent of faculty participation; and (7) perceived benefits. The study found that nearly all of the colleges with formalized honors programs had initiated them to accommodate the increasing number of students who could benefit from the programs. Further, honors programs were created to strengthen the quality of the academic programs and the image of the college, and to attract and retain outstanding students.

In fall 1986, a pilot honors program was initiated in San Diego Community College District (1987) to address the needs of highly motivated students. A four-part evaluation was conducted, which involved a survey of the educational and demographic background of all honors students, student evaluation of honors courses and instructors, program administration, and students by the faculty. The findings revealed that students were generally enthusiastic about the honors program and expressed appreciation for the individualized instruction, small class size, intellectual challenge and high standards.

Honors Curriculum. Research on the curriculum of honors programs has been conducted in the last 10 years. Generally, these programs provide academically talented students with an opportunity for educational challenge and stimulation through sections of core curriculum courses specifically designed and designated as honors sections and honors courses offered within major fields of study (John C. Calhoun State Community College, 1984; Lehner, 1984). Cohen (1985) examined the limitations and characteristics of honors programs. Cohen maintains that there is a lack of empirical data documenting the effects of honors programs on recruitment, retention, and public image. In his analysis of honors programs in the community college, Cohen reviewed efforts to maintain high admissions standards in these programs and the instructional models available, including the course-centered program, the single-track or prescribed curriculum program, the core-oriented program, the individualized honors program, and the comprehensive program.

In summarizing the rewards for faculty initiative provided by honors programs, Cohen stresses that: (1) honors programs can be conducted at a minimal level at little cost; (2) because honors programs rely heavily on faculty initiative, the individual can make a difference; (3) faculty are afforded close contact with students and ideas; and (4) honors programs bring community colleges back to their initial promise of educational opportunity for all. In the Philadelphia community college, central program features are practices that build an intellectual community among faculty and students, including an interdisciplinary curriculum, seminars and writing groups, overlapping first-and second-semester student groups, and a collegial model of faculty development (McGrath & Seymour, 1996). In California, the Transfer Alliance Program (TAP) provides students at selected community colleges the opportunity to

participate in a rigorous academic experience. The curriculum of TAP consists of a core of enriched general education courses, which require students to engage in writing, reading, and research, more extensive than that offered in general transfer courses (Banks & Byock, 1991).

Student Performance and Characteristics. In general the research on honors programs is limited. A few studies have been conducted to investigate student outcomes in relation to the impact of honors programs. Studies have included examining the learning style preferences of students in honors programs (Piland et al., 1990), while others have specifically examined the demographic and educational characteristics of students in honors programs (Armstrong & DeMeo, 1989; Day, 1982; Piland & Azbell, 1984). Additionally, studies have focused on the academic and adjustment process of former honors students at a senior institution (Laanan, 1996, 1998).

Transfer Adjustment Process

In addition to exploring the phenomenon of transfer shock, much of the recent research on community college transfer students has examined the transfer phenomenon from two other perspectives: (1) the student or institutional characteristics associated with transfer students' persistence at senior institutions; and (2) the relationship between transfer students' academic performance at senior institutions and personal, demographic, or environmental characteristics (Graham & Hughes, 1994).

Transfer Students' Persistence at Senior Institutions. Comparisons between the academic performance of transfer and native students have focused on attrition and persistence, graduation rates, and academic probation. Cohen and Brawer (1982) compared the attrition and graduation rates and the GPAs of transfer and native students. They found that community college transfer students had lower GPAs and higher attrition rates than native students. Richardson and Doucette (1980) used both GPAs and persistence rates to compare community college transfer students to native students and found differences among different types of receiving institutions. Graham and Dallam (1986) contrasted all transfer students (those from both four-year institutions and community colleges) with native students, using academic probation as an indicator of scholastic performance and found that both groups of transfer students were more likely to end up on academic probation than were native students.

Personal, Demographic or Environmental Characteristics. Research on transfer students has also sought to identify predictive variables associated with the persistence of transfer students at senior institutions. These studies applied models of student persistence in four-year colleges to transfer students. Using Tinto's (1987) constructs of social and academic integration as predictors of persistence in four-year colleges, Pascarella, Smart, and Ethington (1986) investigated the relevance of this model for transfer students' persistence. They found that the variables associated with social and academic

integration played a role in the persistence of transfer students at four-year colleges and universities. Further, Johnson (1987) examined the relationship between transfer students' persistence and four outcome measures: (1) the perceived practical value of education; (2) educational aspirations; (3) academic factors (i.e., satisfaction, performance, self-concept, and integration); and (4) external factors (i.e., family, job, and financial). She found a relationship between persistence and academic satisfaction, performance, integration, and the perceived practical value of education. As a result of the preliminary investigations into the personal, demographic, and environmental characteristics of community college transfer students, the findings suggest that these factors may affect performance at senior institutions (Graham & Hughes, 1994).

In 1981, Phlegar, Andrew and McLaughlin conducted a study in an effort to clarify the conflicting results of the research on transfer students. Specifically, they sought to identify prior academic performance, personal, and environmental variables that would predict the academic performance of transfer students at senior institutions. They found that students who met the key requirements of senior institutions (i.e., math, science, and English) performed better than other transfers by two- to four-tenths of a grade point. Conversely, Hughes and Graham (1992) identified only one variable, class attendance at the community college that distinguished between satisfactory and non-satisfactory performance during the first semester after transfer. For research projects focusing on personal, demographic or environmental characteristics, Graham and Hughes (1994) argue that the relationship between these variables and academic performance over time needs to be assessed to determine the extent to which transfer shock may occur in the first semester of transfer, thus overshadowing the effects of variables that may be predictive of long-term academic success.

CONCEPTUAL PERSPECTIVES

Two conceptual perspectives help guide this study, Pace's concept of Quality of Effort (1980, 1984) and the concept of "culture shock" (Oberg, 1960).

A conceptual perspective that is helpful for this study is Pace's (1980, 1984) concept of "Quality of Effort" (QE). Using the College and University Environment Scales (CUES), George Stern and C. Robert Pace are credited to have pioneered the concept of QE and its effects on various outcomes by examining the "environmental press" as a factor in student development. After 20 years of using the CUES, which focused on institutional accountability, Pace modified his environmental analysis to include student accountability. According to Pace (1992, p. 4), "accountability for achievement and related student outcomes must consider both what the institution offers and what the students do with those offerings." This conceptual perspective gave rise to the new measurement devise called QE. The

instruments prior to the QE focused on the environment, which attempted to evaluate the places where certain types of developmental activities transpired (e.g., classrooms, libraries, laboratories, student unions, etc.). Building from this premise, the purpose of the QE instrument was to measure student behavior within those settings to assess the level of effort and to correlate that effort with an outcome measure.

The underlying principle of the QE is that what a student gets out of college is dependent not only upon what the college does or does not do but also on the extent and quality of effort that the student puts into college. To assess students' level of involvement, Pace developed the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ). This instrument includes fourteen quality of effort scales that estimates a student's use of an institution's facilities and opportunities. These scales cover a broad range of student activities including library experiences, course learning, experiences in writing, the student union, experiences with faculty, topics of conversation, and personal experiences. For each scale, students are asked to report the *frequency* with which they did a variety of activities. The activities represent varying levels or qualities of experience that "reflects a unidimensional hierarchy, meaning they are interdependent, in the sense that engagement in the higher quality and most difficult activities subsumes engagement in the lower quality or easier activities (Pace, 1984, p. 11). The conceptual origins of the CSEQ derived from a variety of views and concepts about the nature of higher education, about accountability, about student learning and development, and about the need for new measures in the evaluation of higher education programs.

The concept of quality is based on two perspectives. First, education is both a process and a product. Typically, when educational programs are evaluated, the view has been to think of education as a product (e.g., knowledge acquisition, improvement of skills, attitudes and values modified, and personal traits developed). This rationale gave rise to Pace's notion that the quality of the educational experience or process should also be accounted for. That is, it is equally important to measure the quality of the process as well as the quality of the product. Second, all learning and development require an investment of time and effort by the student (1984, p. 5). *Time* is a frequency dimension, while *effort* is a quality dimension. Pace posits that quality of experience and quality of effort are similar concepts, connected with one another in that the likelihood of having high quality of effort depends on investing high quality of effort.

Pace's QE framework enhances the understanding of student development. As applied to this study, it is important to consider the process by which students are involved or engaged in certain academic and social activities. Further, all learning and development requires an investment of time and effort by the students. For transfer students, the extent to which they are involved and spend quality time

in various activities will impact outcomes that include satisfaction, involvement, and adjustment. This framework enables the researcher to measure students' use of campus facilities and opportunities provided by the college for their learning and development, thus, taking the responsibility from the institution and making students accountable for their actions. It is important, however, to take into account the unique environment of the community college and the extent to which it differs from a four-year university. This study seeks to identify if whether the amount, scope, and quality of students' effort is a key to identifying the quality of the educational process.

Culture Shock: An Alternative Framework

Another conceptual framework that guides this study derives from the research conducted by Oberg (1960) and Ward and Kennedy (1993). The "culture shock" phenomenon, which was developed by Kalvero Oberg (1960), is credited for the early writings on the subject. He depicted culture shock as a mental illness, an occupational pathology for persons transplanted abroad precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all of our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse. The culture shock phenomenon has been used interchangeably with the "sojourner experience" in the research literature. According to Oberg, culture shock is characterized as moving from an original place of origin to a foreign environment (e.g., international students, Peace Corps volunteers). Individuals (or sojourners) have to adjust and/or adapt to the new signs and symbols of the foreign environment. When entering a strange culture, all or most familiar cues are removed. More recently, Ward and Kennedy (1993) have employed the culture shock concept in their research in studying the cross-cultural relocation of individuals. Specifically, during the cross-cultural relocation process, there are two important factors that explain the adjustment process. First, in the psychological adjustment process, the extent to which individuals are successful in their adjustment to the foreign environment can be explained in his/her ability to cope and deal with the stress of making the transition. Also, the extent to which individuals are satisfied and the perception of well-being highly impacts the relocation process. Second, in the socio-cultural adjustment process, the success of an individual making the crossover to the foreign environment is highly dependent on the extent to which individuals perceive that they possess the social skills and have the ability to "fit in" in the new environment.

As applied to this study, for community college students, moving from the two- to the four-year is similar to the experience of sojourners. During the transition or movement of students, the place of origin is the community college, while the foreign environment is the university. Given the unique institutional, faculty, and student culture at the two- versus four-year, students will be required to make numerous adjustments. For transfer students, possessing the coping mechanisms to deal with the stress, and the

extent to which they have the skills to fit in and become involved highly impacts their successful cross-cultural relocation from the community college to the university.

DATA SOURCES AND METHODS

The site of the study was the campus of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), one of the nine campuses of the University of California system. A Research I institution under the Carnegie Classification System, UCLA is a large and complex university devoted to undergraduate and graduate scholarship, research, and public service. Its many academic programs are rated among the best in the nation, some among the best in the world. The College of Letters and Science and 11 professional schools serve more than 33,000 students. Located in West Los Angeles, UCLA is close to numerous neighboring community colleges.

Population and Sample

The target population for this cross-sectional study included 2,369 students who transferred from California Community College (CCC) to UCLA in spring and fall 1994 and 1995. Unlike freshmen students, transfers are admitted to UCLA during the fall and spring quarters. The population was identified from reports generated by the Registrar's Office at UCLA. As a result of receiving support from the UCLA administration, and approval from the Human Subjects Office, the researcher had access to information pertaining to undergraduate transfer students.

To properly identify the sample, a crosstabulation was computed on the variables COMMUNITY COLLEGE NAME by STUDENT STATUS. This crosstabulation procedure categorized students in two groups (i.e., TAP or non-TAP) and by the community college from which they transferred. The crosstabulation revealed that students from 16 TAP colleges (see Table 7) were included in the sample. Since one of the purposes of this study was to compare TAP and non-TAP students, the non-TAP students from the 16 TAP colleges comprised the comparative sample set (n=392). To derive the final working data set in the analysis by student status, several conditions needed to be met. First, non-TAP students who enrolled in honors courses at the two-year were removed from the comparison group to achieve an unbiased comparative group. Of the 392 non-TAP students, 73 had enrolled in honors courses and were removed from the analysis (n=319). Second, the inclusion of non-TAP students from a particular college was dependent on the extent to which TAP students responded. If no TAP responses were received from particular colleges, any non-TAP responses were excluded from the analysis. As a result, 30 non-TAP students and one TAP student were removed from the analysis due to a lack of institutional match. To control for the effects of the community college environment, only the TAP and

non-TAP sample from the same institution were compared and analyzed. The final sample included 76 TAP and 289 non-TAP students, a total of 365 students.

Instrumentation

Data were collected using a survey instrument. The 304-item Transfer Students' Questionnaire (TSQ) was formulated as a result of extensive review of past survey instruments and previous studies in the area (Astin, 1993; Baker & Siryk, 1984, 1986; Laanan, 1995; Pace, 1979, 1980, 1984, 1990, 1992). This study measured transfer students' non-cognitive or affective traits: attitudes, values, and interests in different areas. According to McMillan (1996), preferences are important in education since they influence motivation and goals, which in turn affect motivation (p. 144). For this study, the Likert-type scale was used to measure levels of agreement with a statement (e.g., "agree strongly" to "disagree strongly"), and the frequency of involvement in an activity (e.g., "very often" to "never").

The TSQ is organized into three main sections: (1) social demographics; (2) community college experiences; and (3) UCLA experiences. The following is a description of each section.

Social Demographics. The social demographics component included questions about year/quarter transferred to UCLA, name of community college, high school GPA, age, racial/ethnic identification, sex, hours working on a job during school, place of residence, educational attainment of parents, degree aspirations, expected graduation date from UCLA, and parental income level.

Community College Experiences. The community college component covered two broad areas: community college experiences and college activities. Under the community college experiences, questions focused on areas such as hours spent on campus, class preparation, and working at a job for pay; GPA; degree attainment; enrollment in honors courses; number of honors courses taken; TAP participation; and TAP transfer. Questions also included students' experiences with courses, honors courses, academic counseling services, transfer process, and Transfer Center. The community college activity section probed students' quality of effort and involvement in: course learning, experiences with faculty, clubs and organizations, and experience in writing.

UCLA Experiences. The UCLA component is organized into two broad areas: UCLA experiences and college activities. UCLA experiences cover items such as major; UCLA GPA; reason for attending UCLA; number of honors courses taken; and participation in transfer summer orientation, honors program, and the Academic Advancement Program Transfer Summer Program (TSP). Additionally, the college activities section included five broad areas: experiences with faculty, clubs and organizations, course learning, involvement activities, and academic counseling services. Statements about students' general perceptions of UCLA, adjustment process, and overall satisfaction were also

included. Finally, three additional sections, which include self-ratings on various dimensions (e.g., academic ability, and leadership ability), hours per week doing an activity, and estimates, were included. The rationale for including additional items on the survey instrument was to collect data that will be useful in providing a comprehensive profile of transfer students.

The survey instruments were mailed to students' home addresses during week three of fall quarter 1996. Students were given a deadline of three weeks from receipt to return the survey instrument. The instrument was accompanied by a cover letter from the Provost of UCLA's College of Letters and Science encouraging students to participate in the study. The purpose of including a letter from the Provost was to elicit a positive response from students. Further, to facilitate a high response rate, a complimentary Business Reply Envelope was provided. A second and third wave of questionnaires was mailed to students who did not respond to the first wave.

Variables in the Study

The dependent variable (see **Table 4**) used in this study was created from students' response to a series of statements about their academic adjustment process. Students were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the numerous statements regarding their academic adjustment process (where 4 = "agree strongly" and 1 = "disagree strongly"). Exploratory factor analysis was conducted as a data reduction technique to determine the dimension of academic adjustment. The scale score was derived by summing each student's scores on the factor items. The academic adjustment factor is comprised of five items. The construct was used instead of a single variable to measure academic adjustment process because the construct provides a more meaningful understanding of the complex phenomenon of student adjustment.

The independent variables (see **Table 5**) used in this study are organized into three categories: (1) Social Demographics block, (2) Community College Environment block; and (3) UCLA Environment block. Within the Community College block, there were nine factors used as independent variables (see Table 6). Similarly, there were nine factors for the UCLA block (see Table 6). These factors measure students' quality of effort and level of involvement in various academic and social activities at the two- and four-year environment.

Analytic Approach

Descriptive statistics were conducted to provide a profile of transfer students in the sample. Crosstabulations were employed to examine the relationship between various row and column percentages. In addition to conducting descriptive analyses, a t-test of independent samples was

performed. Descriptive statistics for each group and Levene's test for equality of variances were generated, as well as both equal- and unequal-variance t values and a 95% confidence interval for the difference in means. A parametric statistical equation, the t-test was used to test the null hypothesis that the means of the groups are the same (McMillan, 1996). For this study, statistical significance was determined by probability values of less than .05.

Finally, linear multiple regressing using the stepwise selection method was employed to construct the regression model. That is, the variables were entered in specific blocks to determine which social demographic, community college, or UCLA variables contributed to the outcome measures under investigation. The independent variables (e.g., traditional versus non-traditional, TAP versus non-TAP, and white versus non-white) were dummy coded for the analysis. As a result of employing factor analysis, dimensions were derived that characterize students' college experiences at the two- and four-year environments. The factor scores were used to calculate the composite of each dimension (see Appendix A for a description of each factor and the variables that make-up the factors). The rationale for conducting multiple regression was to identify the significant determinants of academic and social adjustment of students.

Variables were entered into a regression equation in the proposed or assumed order in which they are believed to affect, or be experienced by, the student. Therefore, students' social demographics constituted the first block to enter the model. The second block referred to as community college environment, included variables that describe students' experiences (e.g., academic and social involvement). The final block referred to as UCLA environment included variables that describe students' experiences (e.g., academic and social involvement). Using the variable blocks as a causal guide, hierarchical regression was used to measure the relative influence of each group of variables on the outcomes. The rationale for employing this type of regression analysis was to control different blocks of variables according to their known or assumed order of occurrence. The significance level was set at $p<.05$.

Psychometric Properties of the UCLA-TSQ

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted on the community college and UCLA variables as a data reduction technique. The basic assumption of factor analysis (FA) is that underlying dimensions, or factors, can be used to explain complex phenomena. Thus, the goal of FA is to identify the not-directly-observable factors based on a set of observable variables. Since FA entails the creation of factors comprised of more than one variable, this allows for the researcher to better understand and

explain transfer students on a number of complex dimensions. This statistical technique identifies factors that can be used to represent relationships among sets of many interrelated variables.

The extraction technique used was Principal components analysis, which forms linear combinations of the observed variables. Specifically, the first principal component is the combination that accounts for the largest amount of variance in the sample. The second principal component accounts for the next largest amount of variance and is uncorrelated with the first. Successive components explain progressively smaller portions of the total sample variance, and all are uncorrelated with each other. An orthogonal rotation, the varimax rotation was employed in an effort to make the factors more interpretable and to achieve a simple structure (Norusis, 1990). Further, the varimax method attempts to minimize the number of variables that have high loadings on a factor. Factor loadings of .45 or higher were kept in the analysis, and those lower were dropped from the analysis.

The study considered the factor loadings in the context of two environments: the community college and university (or UCLA). Appendix A presents a description of each factor within the two environments. A total of 20 factors were created. The factors represent attitudes and behaviors that characterize transfer students on a number of dimensions. Nine factors emerged within the community college environment and 11 factors in the four-year environment. Appendix A provides a description of the variables that comprise the factors, alpha reliability coefficients, and respective factor loadings.

As a result of running factor analysis, a composite for each factor was calculated. Each composite is comprised of the respective number of variables that make up the factor. A t test of independent samples was performed to determine the extent to which there were statistically significant differences between the mean responses on each factor by age group, student status, and racial/ethnic category.

Reliability and Validity of the Instrument

Reliability measures item consistency and the extent to which the item responses are consistent across constructs (Cresswell, 1994). The most widely used estimate of reliability, internal consistency, indicates the degree of homogeneity among the items in an instrument. Coefficient alphas were calculated for each factor. This method is used with instruments in which there is not right or wrong answer to each item. It is an appropriate type of reliability for attitude instruments and other measures that contain a range of possible answers for each item, such as agree-disagree. **Table 6** reports the reliability coefficients for the factors and the number of items that comprise each factor.

Another measure of reliability is the examination of the test stability. That is, do individuals vary in their responses when the instrument is administered a second time. A stability estimate (McMillan,

1996, p. 124) of reliability is obtained by administering one measure to one group of persons, waiting a specified period of time, and then re-administering the same instrument to the same group of persons. The correlation of the two sets of scores is then calculated. This type of estimate is also called test-retest reliability. What is being measured is the consistency over time of the respondents' performance. For this study, 25 students were administered the first UCLA-TSQ in winter 1996 quarter during the second week. One week later, the same group of students were administered the same questionnaire for the second time. A correlation coefficient was calculated to measure the estimate of respondents' consistency over time from first wave to second wave. The stability estimate yielded a .75 correlation coefficient. According to the literature on survey research, if the correlation coefficient is high, about .75 or .85, the reliability is said to be high or good. Correlation coefficients below .60 generally indicate inadequate or at least weak reliability.

Efforts were made to establish the validity of the survey instrument. To establish the instrument's construct validity, an extensive review of the literature was conducted. According to Alreck and Settle (1985), construct validity is defined as the degree to which the items in the survey instrumentation measure hypothetical constructs or concepts. Prior to sending out the questionnaires, a pilot test of the survey instrument was performed. The purpose of testing the instrument was to establish the face validity of the instrument and to improve questions, format, and the scales. Face validity is defined as the degree to which the items appear to measure what the instrument purports to measure (Borg, Gall & Gall, 1993). The questionnaires were administered to 25 community college transfer students at UCLA. These students were identified as having been enrolled in selected education courses. These students were asked to comment on the wording of questions, organization, relevance of items, and length. Finally, the content validity of the instrument was assessed. Content validity is defined as the degree to which the items measure the "content" they were intended to measure. Content validity was achieved from a previous pilot study conducted by the researcher (Laanan, 1995), and by obtaining feedback from the 25 students who pilot tested the instrument. In addition to the research literature as a guiding theoretical perspective, the investigator consulted with psychometrists, scholars and researchers to validate both the content and construct of the survey instrument.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For this study, 2,369 TSQs were mailed to students. A total of 727 students returned the completed questionnaires, and of these 10 questionnaires were not included in the data analysis due to insufficient information. The final sample was comprised of 717 students from 64 California community colleges, which yielded a response rate of 30%.

Over 59% of students in the sample transferred during fall 1995. Further, about one-third of the students in the sample transferred during fall 1994. In terms of students' age, over 59% of students in the sample were between 21-24. Students in the 25-29 year old age group represented one-fourth of the population. Approximately 62% of the sample was categorized in the traditional age group (i.e., 24 or below), and about 38% of students were identified as non-traditional age (i.e., 25 and over) students.

In the TSQ, students were asked to choose one of 13 options to identify their racial/ethnic background. Students who indicated multiple responses were recoded to the "Other" category, as were those who wrote in other ethnicities (e.g., Armenian, Eurasian, Italian, etc.) that were not available in the list of choices. White students comprised the largest racial group (51%), followed by Mexican/Mexican-American/Chicano students (8.8%), and Chinese/Chinese-Americans (8.6%). Other Spanish-American/Latinos, Vietnamese/Vietnamese-Americans, and Korean/Korean-Americans represented over five percent of all students in the sample. Other ethnic groups in the sample include: African Americans (2.4%), American Indians (0.6%), Filipinos (2.8%), East Indian/Pakistanis (1.0%), Japanese-Americans (4.7%), Pacific Islanders (0.6%), and students in the "Other" (2.8%) category.

When all seven Asian categories (i.e., Filipino, Vietnamese, Chinese, East Indian/Pakistani, Japanese, Korean, and Pacific Islander) were combined into one group, they comprised the second largest number of students (29%). When the two Spanish categories (i.e., Mexican, Other Spanish-American) were combined, they represented 14% of transfer students in the sample.

Overall, men represented 40.6% and women represented 59.4% of the total sample. Over 42% of students in the sample indicated that they lived away from campus in an apartment or home. Students who lived with their parents or relatives comprised 27% of respondents. About 16% indicated that they lived in a private apartment or room within walking distance of the university. Transfer students who lived in residence halls or other university housing made up nine percent of respondents; while the remaining two percent indicated that they lived in a fraternity or sorority house.

The respondents were asked for the educational attainment level of their parents. Regarding their fathers, 19% indicated that they obtained a graduate degree, the modal response. The next most common responses were some college (16.9%), high school graduate (16.5%), and bachelor's degree (16.2%) recipients. Fathers who obtained an associate degree from a community college comprised 3.5%. For mothers, the highest percent were high school graduates (26%), followed by some college (18%), bachelor's degree (13.9%), and elementary school or less (11.3%). Compared to students' fathers, slightly more mothers obtained an associate degree from a two-year college (7.7% versus 3.5%).

A little less than a fourth of students (21%) reported parental income between $25,000-$39,999. Nineteen percent responded that their parents had a total household income of $75,000 or more. Parents earning less than $14,999 category income bracket made up 17% of the sample.

One out of three students in the sample indicated that their highest academic degree planned is a master's. Approximately a quarter (22%) hoped to receive a doctorate. For other professional graduate degrees, 12% of students indicated aspirations in the field of medicine, while 14% indicated an interest in pursuing a degree in law.

Analysis by Student Status

Table 8 depicts the profile of transfer students in the sample by student status. As stated earlier, student status is defined in two categories: TAP and non-TAP students. Students in the TAP category participated in an honors program at their respective community college and were admitted to UCLA as "TAP-certified." Conversely, for this comparative analysis, non-TAP students had no prior honors experience at the two-year college and were selected from the same institution as their TAP counterpart. The purpose of only selecting non-TAP students from TAP colleges was to exert some control over the effects of the college environment.

The crosstabulation results show that of the 365 students comprising the sub-sample, 76 were TAP and 289 were non-TAP students. Almost half of the TAP sample that responded to the UCLA-TSQ transferred during fall 1994 and 1995 quarters. On the other hand, over half of non-TAP students who responded to the UCLA-TSQ transferred during fall 1995 alone. In general, most students in both groups were female. However, compared to female TAP students, female non-TAP students responded at a slightly higher rate (60.2% versus 57.9%).

In terms of students' racial/ethnic background, about three out of every five students in the TAP sample were white, compared to about one-half of the non-TAP students. Chinese/Chinese Americans were proportionately the second highest racial group for both types of students. Compared to TAP students, non-TAP students had larger percentages of Japanese/Japanese Americans (4.2% versus 2.6%), Mexican American/Chicanos (8% versus 2.6%), and other Spanish-American (6.2% versus 2.6%). When the racial/ethnic categories were collapsed, the Asian group was the second highest among TAP (18.3%) and non-TAP students (27.3%), followed by the Hispanic group (5.2% versus 14.2%), respectively.

In terms of students' place of residence during their tenure at UCLA, TAP students were more likely to live in the residence hall or other campus housing (7.9% versus 4.5%) and with their parents or relatives (43.4% versus 29.8%). Conversely, a higher percentage of non-TAP students lived in an off-campus apartment (49.1% versus 34.2%).

In comparing TAP and non-TAP students' parental educational level, TAP students reported that more of their fathers had "some college" (17.1% versus 14.2%) or received an associate degree (3.9% versus 3.8%). TAP students were also more likely to have fathers that completed a graduate degree (35.5% versus 18.7%). Similarly, a higher percentage of TAP students had mothers who completed an associate's degree (9.2% versus 5.9%), bachelor's degree (19.7% versus 12.8%) or graduate degree (14.5% versus 9.3%).

In terms of students' reported parental income, TAP students were more likely to have parents from higher income brackets. A higher percentage of TAP students had parents who earned $60,000-$74,999 (13.2% versus 8%) and $75,000 or more (30.2% versus 17%).

In comparing students' high school GPA, TAP students were more likely to report higher academic performance as measured by GPA, compared to non-TAP students. More TAP students had an "A or A+" (25% versus 13.8%), A- (19.7% versus 15.9%), and B+ average (23.7% versus 21.8%).

In terms of students' degree aspirations, TAP students were more likely to aspire to the doctoral (28.9% versus 19.7%) and medical (14.5% versus 10%) degrees. Conversely, non-TAP students were slightly more likely to pursue the bachelor's (17% versus 13%), and more likely interested in obtaining a master's degree (38.4% versus 21.1%), respectively.

In comparing the average age of students, the mean age among TAP is 24.76, while the mean among non-TAP is 25.71.

Community College Experiences

TAP students had a self-reported higher average GPA. The mean difference was statistically significant ($M = 3.52$ versus $M = 3.40$, $p<.01$). Non-TAP students were more likely to obtain an associate degree prior to transferring, but the difference is not statistically significant. In terms of the amount of time spent on the college campus excluding class attendance, both TAP and non-TAP students spent between 4-6 hours per week on the campus. Similarly, students in both groups spent about the same amount of time studying and/or preparing for classes. Although not statistically significant, non-TAP students were likely to work more hours on a job for pay, compared to TAP students.

Table 9 illustrates the statistically significant findings of students' involvement activities during community college by student status. Students were asked to report the number of hours spent on various activities in the areas of academic, social, and out-of-classroom experiences. In general, TAP students were more likely to spend time doing volunteer work (or community service) and participating in student groups and/or clubs. Conversely, non-TAP students were more likely to spend time reading for pleasure and doing independent research.

There were five meaningful factors that measure students' general perceptions (**see Table 10**) of courses, academic counseling, Transfer Center, activities prior to transferring, and perceptions of the four-year (see Appendix A.1 to A.5 for a description of the variables that comprise each factor). The responses were based on a four-point scale (1=disagree strongly; 2=disagree somewhat; 3=agree somewhat; 4=agree strongly). Of the five general perception factors, only one was statistically significant, favoring TAP students. TAP students scored significantly higher on the academic counseling factor (M=23.04 versus M=21.41, $p<.05$). This finding suggest that TAP students were more likely to agree that the information received from counselors was helpful in the transfer process and that the information helped them to take the courses needed to complete the transfer articulation agreement. Further, TAP students were more likely to have met with their academic counselors on a regular basis, compared to non-TAP students.

A comparative analysis of TAP and non-TAP students was conducted on the four Quality of Effort scales (**see Table 10**). These scales include: (1) course learning; (2) experiences with faculty; (3) experiences with clubs and organizations; and (4) experience in writing. Of the four Quality of Effort scales, the results revealed statistically significant differences on one scale – Clubs and Organizations (M=19.89 versus M=17.16, $p<.05$). In general, TAP students were more likely to attend a program or event put on by a student group; read or ask about a club, organization or student government; attend a meeting of a club or organization; and work in some student organization or special project. In terms of the other scales, the results suggest that both TAP and non-TAP students spend similar time and effort in their interactions with faculty, course learning, and experience in writing.

University Experiences

Table 11 illustrates the results of the frequency analysis of transfer students' UCLA experiences by student status. The table shows the percent responding and the difference between the two groups. A positive difference favors TAP students.

TAP students have a higher UCLA GPA (M = 3.34) compared to non-TAP students (M = 3.19). The GPA calculated was students' fourth quarter average. The results of the t test of independent samples revealed that this difference was statistically significant at the $p<.05$ level.

For both TAP and non-TAP students, about one out of every five students who responded to the UCLA-TSQ did not have a job during their tenure at UCLA. However, TAP students were more likely work between 16 - 30 hours per week (17.1% versus 15.2%). On the other hand, non-TAP students were more likely to work more than 30 hours (11.7% versus 3.9%).

For this sample, 68.4% of TAP and 67.1% of non-TAP students indicated that they attended the Transfer Summer Orientation prior to the start of fall quarter. Overall, more non-TAP students (9.7% versus 3.9%) participated in the six-week intensive academic program that is sponsored by the Academic Advancement Program.

Students were asked to select one of four primary reasons for attending UCLA. For both TAP and non-TAP students, half of the respondents indicated that an important reason for attending UCLA was to obtain a bachelor's degree, followed by the desire to pursue graduate or professional school. Non-TAP students were more likely to indicate the following items: to gain skills necessary to enter new job or occupation (11.8% versus 3.9%) and to satisfy a personal interest (9.7% versus 2.6%).

To simplify the analysis of the undergraduate UCLA majors, the individual majors were collapsed and categorized into nine groups. Of the 365 students in this analysis, 40.8% of TAP students and 44.6% of non-TAP students indicated majors in the Social Sciences. TAP students were more likely to have majors in the Humanities (17.1% versus 15.9%) and Life Sciences (35.5% versus 18.3%). More non-TAP students had majors in the Physical Sciences (9% versus 2.6%).

Seven items comprised the academic counseling factor, which measured students' level of involvement in academic counseling services offered by academic departments and student organizations (See Appendix G). Both groups were similar on this factor thus, the difference was not statistically significant.

For the UCLA environment, three Quality of Effort scales were used to measure students' level of involvement and quality of effort in their academic and social experiences (see Table 12). The scales include: (1) experiences with faculty; (2) experiences with clubs and organizations; and (3) experience in course learning. The results show that both TAP and non-TAP students were similar on the three scales. In other words, the differences between the two groups were not statistically significant. Therefore, TAP and non-TAP were similar in their interaction with faculty on various activities. Both TAP and non-TAP students responded similarly on their quality of effort and involvement in clubs and organizations. Finally, both groups were similar in the extent to which students spent quality time in course preparation, participated in class discussions, and did additional work outside of class.

Table 12 presents the four factors that address the general perceptions of students at UCLA: satisfaction about UCLA, perceptions of faculty, stigma as transfer student, and competition and survival culture. There were no statistically significant differences between TAP and non-TAP students on all four factors. The results suggest that TAP and non-TAP students have similar agreement in their overall general perceptions of UCLA.

Three factors emerged from the factor analysis that measured students' overall adjustment process. According to **Table 12**, the findings did not reveal any statistically significant differences between TAP and non-TAP students on the three dimensions under adjustment. Thus, both groups were likely to have similar experiences in their adjustment processes at UCLA.

Regression Analysis

The academic adjustment dependent variable is characterized by students' overall academic experiences at UCLA. This dimension is comprised of five items: adjusting to the academic standards has been difficult, I experienced a dip in grades during the first and second quarter, my level of stress increased when I started UCLA, it was difficult going from the semester to the 10-week quarter system, and there is a sense of competition between and among students that is not found in community colleges. Students who score high on this dimension experience an overall difficulty in adjusting to the academic environment at UCLA. **Table 13** indicates the variables entering the regression equation for all students on the dependent variable, as well as corresponding simple correlations, R squared, and standardized regression coefficients (Betas) for each variable. The table also reports the beta coefficients after controlling for inputs and the two-year environment. Of the 43 independent variables included in the regression equation 12 entered. The listwise deletion method yielded a final sample of 442 students. Refer to **Table 14** for the complete beta coefficients at each step.

Among the social demographic variables, students' parental income and sex entered the regression. Family income is negatively associated with the dependent variable (r=-.14), whereas being female has a weak positive correlation. The results suggest that the lower a student's parental income the more likely he/she will experience a difficult academic adjustment. Further, compared to men, women were more likely to experience difficulty in their academic adjustment at UCLA. The two variables that entered the regression accounted for four percent of the variance.

Of the community college variables, perceptions of the four-year and experience with counselors dimensions were positive predictors of students' academic adjustment. That is, students who had insecure feelings about the four-year while at the community college and who had higher levels of involvement with academic counselors were more likely to experience a difficult academic adjustment process at UCLA. Conversely, course learning entered negatively on the dependent variable. Students who had high quality of effort in course learning were less likely to experience a difficult academic adjustment. In addition to the social demographic variables, the three community college variables accounted for 26% of the variance.

For the UCLA environment, seven independent variables entered the regression; of them two had negative final betas (i.e., UCLA GPA and Intellectual self-confidence self-rating). The higher the GPA at UCLA and higher a student's intellectual self-confidence, the less likely students experienced a difficult academic adjustment process. The UCLA environment variable most strongly associated with the dependent variable is "competition and survival culture" (r=.41). This dimension includes students' perceptions of the competitive nature among students, feelings of not "fitting in" on the campus, and being treated like "numbers in a book." Other predictors are: academic counseling, hours per week spent studying and doing homework, perceptions of faculty, and attendance at academic workshops. Students who spent a lot of time with academic counselors, doing homework, and attending academic workshops at Griffin Commons were more likely to experience difficulty adjusting to the academic standards. If students had higher agreement on the perceptions of faculty dimension, they were also more likely to experience academic difficulty. With the 12 variables in the equation, 47% of the variance is accounted for in the regression model.

At the final step, the two social demographic variables (i.e., income and female) were not statistically significant. After controlling for the two-year environment, the perceptions of the four-year and experiences with counselors dimensions remained statistically significant at the last step. The remaining seven dimensions under the UCLA environment also were all statistically significant at the last step.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study found that TAP students tend to be white, younger, come from families with higher parental education attainment level and income, and have higher degree aspirations compared their counterparts. These findings are similar to Laanan's (1996) study in which he found that TAP students tend to be white and come from families in higher income brackets. Although this study did not focus on why students participate in TAP, further study is warranted on examining the phenomenon of the background characteristics of students who choose to participate in the honors program.

The finding that TAP students, in general, have higher degree aspirations toward the doctorate, medical and law field suggests that these students are socialized in the TAP environment. According to Banks and Byock (1991), TAP can be viewed as a program that provides a socializing experience for students. That is, participation in TAP will have an affect on the "talent development" of both students and faculty. A plausible explanation for TAP students' aspiration may be the fact that these students are generally involved and integrated into the academic community and will tend to develop a greater goal orientation as a result of their association with TAP.

In the community college, TAP students had a significantly higher GPA (3.52 versus 3.40) than non-TAP students. TAP students spent significantly more time doing volunteer work and participating in student clubs or groups than non-TAP students. Conversely, non-TAP students spent significantly more time reading for pleasure and doing independent research. The findings suggest that TAP students at the two-year college were more likely to spend their time outside of class engaging in extra-curricular activities, while non-TAP students spend their free time engaged in intellectual activities. For students who participate in TAP at the community college, the courses are usually more rigorous than non-honors courses and require more reading, writing and research. The finding that non-TAP students study more outside of class does not support this notion.

In terms of students' general perceptions of the two-year environment, only one dimension yielded a statistically significant difference between TAP and non-TAP students. TAP students were more likely to consult with academic counselors on a regular basis and report that the information received was helpful in the transfer process. This finding is not surprising because one benefit of being a TAP student is the assignment of a personal academic counselor - TAP students do not have to compete with the rest of the student population to make an appointment with counselors. Another component of TAP is the curricular and faculty linkages between the two- and four-year environments. That is, an important component of TAP is to provide TAP students with an opportunity to visit UCLA and participate in campus tours. The goal of this activity is to educate prospective transfers to UCLA and the campus resources and to expose students to the institutional culture of the university.

In terms of students' quality of effort at the two-year college, only one difference was statistically significant: TAP students were more likely to have higher levels of involvement in clubs and organizations. For the other three dimensions - experiences with faculty, course learning, writing, both TAP and non-TAP students were similar. For students who participate in TAP, the honors courses are limited in size in order to enhance the interaction with faculty and students. Given the small class size, one would expect that TAP students would spend more time talking with faculty outside of class about projects or assignments. However, the results suggest that although both groups differ in the clubs and organizations dimension, they do not differ in their academic experiences.

At UCLA, TAP students had a significantly higher GPA (3.34 versus 3.19) than non-TAP students. Also, about one out of three (or 30.3%) TAP students were members of the College of Letters and Sciences honors program compared to about one out of ten (8.7%) non-TAP students. The finding suggests that TAP students are performing well academically and that they are more likely to continue their involvement with rigorous courses as a result of taking honors courses at the community college. Perhaps a possible explanation is that TAP students are interested in maintaining their level of academic

achievement since they are more likely to aspire to degrees beyond the baccalaureate. Since more TAP students aspire to professional degrees (e.g., doctoral, medical, and law degrees), perhaps TAP students believe that the admissions process for these competitive programs prefer rigorous course schedules of students.

In terms of students' quality of effort at UCLA, there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups. However, similar to their community college experience, TAP students had higher involvement in clubs and organizations. Conversely, non-TAP students had slightly higher involvement and quality of effort in their experiences with faculty, course learning and academic counselor dimensions. This finding suggests that both TAP and non-TAP students tend to be similar on these dimensions at UCLA.

Four dimensions were developed to assess students' overall perceptions of UCLA. None of the dimensions yielded statistically significant differences on the mean responses of TAP and non-TAP students. The findings suggest that at UCLA, both TAP and non-TAP students are likely to have similar agreement on their level of satisfaction with UCLA. That is, both groups agree that they would recommend other transfers to come to UCLA and that the university is an intellectually and exciting place to be. For the other dimensions, both groups were also similar in their perceptions of faculty, stigma as transfer student and competition and survival culture factors. Because they were similar, students are likely to have perceptions about faculty being non-student oriented, and instead, more interested in research. These perceptions could be attributed to the perpetuation of stereotypes that students hold about faculty at research universities.

In order to investigate students' overall adjustment process at UCLA, three dimensions were created as a result of factor analysis: psychological, academic and social. The results yielded no statistically significant differences between TAP and non-TAP students. However, TAP students had slightly more agreement that adjusting to the social environment was not difficult and that they were meeting as many people and making as many friends as they would like. On the other hand, non-TAP students had slightly more agreement that they felt intimidated and overwhelmed by the size of the student body and classes. Further, non-TAP students had slightly more agreement that they experienced difficulty adjusting to the academic standards at UCLA. Although the findings were not statistically significant, the results suggest that TAP students may be marginally better prepared for the academic standards and social environment of UCLA. A major purpose of TAP is to foster students' academic preparedness and to socialize students to become successful at UCLA, and, to a limited degree, it appears to be succeeding.

In summary, this study hypothesized that there is no difference between TAP and non-TAP students in terms of their academic achievement, level of involvement, quality of effort, general perceptions, academic and social adjustment, and overall satisfaction. The results of the study found that TAP students have significantly higher GPAs both at the two- and four-year. This finding is supported by a previous study conducted by Banks and Byock (1991). Although TAP and non-TAP students differ on academic achievement, TAP and non-TAP students tend to be similar on the other outcomes. Given the socializing aspect of TAP, one would expect that TAP students would have different experiences at the university. In other words, TAP students would have higher quality of effort or level of involvement in different activities. However, based on the empirical evidence, this study found that at UCLA, both TAP and non-TAP students were similar in the areas of quality of effort, general perceptions, and adjustment processes. As a result, the null hypothesis that there is no difference between TAP and non-TAP is not rejected.

In predicting students' academic adjustment at UCLA, the social demographic variables lose their significant effects at the last step. Of the three community college environment dimensions that entered, students' perceptions of the four-year environment, and experiences with counselors remained statistically significant at the last step. Therefore, students who tend to have negative perceptions about the four-year environment will more than likely experience difficulty adjusting to the academic standards at UCLA. On the other hand, students who spend a lot of time with academic counselors will likely find it more difficult to adjust. A possible explanation is that students are seeking assistance from counselors because they are experiencing difficulty and that they are interested in learning about the college process and transfer.

In the UCLA environment, there were two negative predictors of academic adjustment: GPA and intellectual self-confidence. That is, students who are not doing well academically, as measured by their GPA, and students who indicate that they have low self-confidence in their intellectual ability will have difficulty in adjusting academically. Both of these go hand in hand. Students who think that they are inferior academically will manifest their thoughts in the way in which they approach course learning. Students who spend many hours studying or doing homework will likely experience a more difficult adjustment. This finding suggests that many hours studying does not necessarily yield mastery of course material. In other words, it is the quality of effort in which a student puts into the process. Mastering course material does not always require spending numerous hours. Therefore, this finding suggests that students who exhibit quality studying habits are those who may not be spending a lot of hours mastering course material. Further, students who attend university-sponsored academic workshops will likely experience academic difficulty. Students who take advantage of these workshops are likely those who are

seeking ways to facilitate their adjustment to the university. By participating in these workshops, students are taking proactive steps to either improve their learning skills or address a learning deficiency. Thus, students who spend time participating in these workshops will acquire the knowledge needed to make the necessary changes to achieve successful outcomes.

Students who strongly agreed that there is a competitive nature among students will likely experience difficulty, whereas students who are able to focus less on the competition and more on their individual learning will likely experience a positive academic adjustment. Similarly, if students perceive that faculty are not difficult to approach they will also experience a smoother academic adjustment. Students who perceive that faculty are easy to approach will more than likely take advantage of office hours and seek assistance on class assignments and projects. The more information students have about the expectations of the faculty for a particular class, the greater the likelihood that students will successfully meet those expectations. Finally, students who seek academic counseling are likely to experience academic difficulty. One way to interpret this finding is that students are spending time with counselors because they are experiencing some difficulty – academic or social. As a result, students are seeking the services of counselors to obtain guidance and/or assistance. Another explanation is that this finding suggests that students who seek counseling are making the effort to address questions or concerns about their academic experience. As a result, students will become more familiar with requirements and will receive recommendations about ways to improve their academic performance.

In summary, for students to be successful in their academic adjustment at UCLA, there are important factors that are critical in the two-year environment. That is, students who meet with academic counselors will have a higher chance of experiencing academic difficult. By visiting counselors on a regular basis, students are likely to be informed about many aspects of the university. This involvement also provides students with opportunities to ask questions about admissions, academics, social and academic expectations, and many other topics. Also, students who seek out counselors are more than likely to be students who are proactive in their learning strategies. In other words, these students are making the effort and devoting the time, which will be beneficial upon transferring. Also, the more students feel insecure about the university environment, the greater the chance they will experience academic difficult. At the UCLA environment, there are several factors that are powerful predictors of students' academic adjustment. Spending time studying and doing homework and attending academic workshops are all positive predictors of academic adjustment. In other words, students who spend a lot of time in these activities will more likely experience a difficult adjustment. It is not the amount of studying, rather the quality in which students devote in the process of learning. Students' academic achievement as measured by GPA and intellectual self-confidence both are negatively related to academic adjustment.

That is, for students who are performing well academically and who have high self-concept in their intellectual ability will likely experience less difficult adjusting than students who are lower on both of these. The overall findings suggest that although there are two factors from the two-year college that predicts students' academic achievement, a larger contribution is in the environment of the four-year. Therefore, what students do after they arrive at the four-year will positively or negatively affect their academic adjustment process.

The purpose of this study was to examine how students differed in their college experiences, both at the two- and four-year environments. Compared to non-TAP students, TAP students are likely to come from higher socio-economic background, be female, and be of traditional age. Although TAP and non-TAP students differed significantly on academic achievement, their college experiences in terms of involvement, quality of effort, general perceptions, and adjustment processes were similar. Based in the literature, we would expect TAP students to be different from their counterparts. However, the findings show that both TAP and non-TAP students were similar in the outcome measures.

Another objective of the study was to offer new frameworks to understand the adjustment process of students from the social and psychological perspectives. Building from previous research in this area, one construct (or dimension) was developed to operationalize the complex adjustment process. In predicting students' academic and social adjustment, the fact that none of the social demographic variables did not enter (e.g., age, TAP status, and racial/ethnic category) suggest that although these factors likely play a role in who attends college and who transfers to a four-year institution, these characteristics lose their significance and wash out in their prediction of students' adjustment. In other words, it is likely that what a student brings to the college environment will have an impact on their academic and social experiences. However, it is what the student does once he/she arrives that will determine the extent to which a successful adjustment experiences will be achieved.

Moreover, the findings suggest that important involvement and quality of effort variables contribute to students' positive adjustment process, which support Astin's theory of student involvement and Pace's concept of Quality of Effort. Specific involvement variables are determinants of a successful academic and social adjustment process at the four-year environment. Moreover, students' quality of effort at the two- and four-year environments are significant determinants of a successful transition.

This study showed that although TAP students had significantly higher GPAs both at the community college and at UCLA, their experiences in terms of their quality of effort and adjustment processes were similar to non-TAP students. TAP is a program that seems to be expanding since the number of participating TAP colleges has grown in the last five years. It is important to note that TAP student are likely to be from a non-minority background, have parents with higher educational levels and

income brackets compared to their counterparts. In other words, TAP students are likely to come from higher socioeconomic backgrounds. Although the literature about honors programs challenge the notions of such programs as being "elitist" in nature, it begs the question about the continued low participation rates of underrepresented students (i.e., African Americans, Hispanics). Early documents about TAP found in CPEC highlight the purpose of TAP as a program to increase the underrepresented populations in community colleges to transfer to a four-year institution. Further exploration is warranted to determine why the participation of such groups remains unchanged.

With the implementation of Proposition 209, students from racial/ethnic groups who have been historically underrepresented in higher education will not be given any type of preferential treatment. TAP can be viewed by faculty, administrators, policy makers and students as a possible avenue to increase the likelihood of admission to UCLA. Although the program does not guarantee admission, but instead gives priority consideration in the admission process, students who pursue this route have a greater chance of being admitted to UCLA as a TAP-transfer. However, in terms of the non-significant differences between TAP and non-TAP students in their adjustment process, it is possible to infer that students are likely to be similar in their perceptions about their overall college experiences. In other words, since TAP is a program that is supposed to provide prospective transfers an edge by requiring students to take more rigorous courses, and to provide programs that introduce students to UCLA, this study raises the question of how exactly TAP prepares students. Supporters of TAP would argue that TAP students would be significantly different from their counterparts. However, this study did not support this notion. A possible interpretation of this finding is that non-TAP students are performing just as well as TAP and are no different. It is also possible that the power of TAP, what it does for the participants, is so weak that it does not effect differential activities or achievements across groups.

Because getting into UCLA has become increasingly competitive, non-TAP students are still expected to have high GPAs and background experiences that make them stand out during the admissions process. The average transfer GPA has increased substantially in the last ten years. Therefore, for any transfer student to be competitive, he/she must have excellent credentials when applying to UCLA. Because there is still little research on TAP students, the questions will still be left unanswered about the impact of TAP on students, faculty, and the two-year colleges. Also, not until there are empirical data available (i.e., quantitative and qualitative), could improvements to the program be made. Finally, TAP programs will differ across the 25 colleges in terms of course rigor and expectations. Although there are standard elements for a TAP college, accountability measures to date have not been established.

Limitations of the Study

This study had several limitations. Because the data gathering procedure entailed utilizing a survey instrument, the willingness, interest, and ability of individuals to respond to all questions, to respond in a timely fashion, and to respond accurately could not be controlled by the investigator. This limitation is critical to this study because any lack of interest from the respondents can affect the outcomes of the study.

An analysis of non-respondents was not conducted. As a result, this study is limited in that it does not provide information about students who chose to not respond to the TSQ. If the researcher had conducted a procedure to identify the background characteristics and college experiences of non-respondents, it would be possible to determine the extent to which there was bias in the respondents. In addition, the TSQ was a very long instrument. Perhaps because of the length, students opted to not complete and return the survey.

For the TAP and non-TAP sample, the decision to choose non-TAP students only from the TAP colleges reduced the "statistical power" among the non-TAP sample. In other words, because the sample was limited to an institutional match, the statistical power among the non-TAP students was reduced.

A limitation is apparent in that the sample for the study derived from only one major research four-year university, located in Southern California. Although the findings from this study yielded valuable insight about community college transfer students, any generalizations about transfer students who transfer to a senior institution must be made with caution. Four-year institutions differ in their size, selectivity, and location. Depending on the environmental culture of the four-year university, students, who transfer will likely have different experiences.

Finally, this study was cross-sectional in nature and not longitudinal, which did not allow the researcher to measure change over time. Instead, this type of study is considered to be retrospective, which required students to reflect on their past and current experiences.

Future Research

For future research projects in this area, studies that are longitudinal in nature should be employed. Since most four-year institutions conduct orientation sessions for new students prior to the beginning of the fall term, a built-in survey could be conducted. Follow-up surveys should also be considered to measure the change over time. The majority of the research on transfer students at senior institutions typically measures traditional outcomes such as achievement, retention, and graduation rates. Although these are important measures, it is important to look beyond the quantitative measure and to ask other questions about students' overall college experiences.

Another recommendation for researchers to consider is to disaggregate the racial/ethnic groups. In other words, examining student outcomes within each group is just as important as collapsing groups. Due to the changing demographics of students on college campuses, there is a need for researchers, administrators, and student affairs professionals to begin to understand how different racial/ethnic groups differ within the group and between other groups.

Finally, in addition to collecting closed-ended responses from students, incorporating qualitative components in the research design would yield valuable information about students. Conducting focus groups or interviewing students would allow the researcher to obtain information not easily measurable by survey instruments. Qualitative information provides rich information that can be used to broaden the understanding of students.

REFERENCES

Alreck, P. L., and Settle, R. B. (1985). *The survey research handbook.* Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

American Association of Community Colleges. (1998). *Pocket profile of community colleges: Trends & statistics 1995-1996.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Baker, R. W., and Siryk, B. (1984). Measuring adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*(2), 179-189.

Baker, R. W., and Siryk, B. (1986). Exploratory intervention with a scale measuring adjustment to college. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*(1), 31-38.

Banks, D., and Byock, G. (1991). The effects of the Transfer Alliance Program on its colleges, faculty, and students. University of California, Los Angeles. Office of Academic Interinstitutional Program. ED 332 761.

Best, G., and Gehring, D. (1993). The academic performance of community college transfer students at a major state university in Kentucky. *Community College Review, 21*(2), 32-41.

Borg, W. R., Gall, J. P., & Gall, M. D. (1993). *Applying educational research: A practical guide.* Third Edition. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Bulakowski, C., and Townsend, B. K. (1995). Evaluation of a community college honors program: Problems and Possibilities. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 19*(6), 485-499.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. (1990). Transfer and articulation in the 1990s: California in the larger picture. Commission Report 90-30. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Cejda, B. (1994). Reducing transfer shock through faculty collaboration: A case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 18*(2), 189-199.

Cohen, A. M., and Brawer, F. B. (1982). *The American Community College.* First Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cohen, A. M., and Brawer, F. B. (1989). *The American Community College.* Second Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cohen, A. M., and Brawer, F. B. (1996). *The American Community College.* Third Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cohen, L. L. (1985). Honors programs in the community college: Reality and promise. In Current Issues for the Community College: Essays by Fellows in the Mid-Career Fellowship Program at Princeton University. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University. ED 265 906.

Cresswel, J. W. (1994). *Research design. Qualitative & quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Day, M. (1982). Characteristics of honors students. Maricopa Community Colleges, Spring 1981-1982. Report Number 82-6. ED 223 269.

Diaz, P. (1992). Effects of transfer on academic performance of community college students at the four-year institution. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 16*(3), 279-291.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges. (1984). Community College Honors Programs. ERIC Digest. ED 353 007.

Friedlander, J. (1982). Honors programs in community colleges. Los Angeles, CA: Center for the Study of Community Colleges. ED 220 166.

Friedlander, J. (1983). Honors programs in community colleges. *Community and Junior College Journal, 53*(5), 26-28.

Graham, S. W., and Dallam, J. (1986). Academic probation as a measure of performance: Contrasting transfer students to native students. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 10*(1), 23-24.

Graham, S. W., and Hughes, J. A. (1994). Moving down the road: Community college students' academic performance at the university. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 18*(5), 449-464.

Heck, J. (1986). Establishing community college honors programs. Paper presented at the Annual National Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (66th, Orlando, FL, April 13-16, 1986). ED 270 134.

Hill, J. (1965). Transfer shock: The academic performance of the junior college transfer. Journal of Experimental Education, 33, 201-216.

Hughes, J. A., and Graham, S. W. (1992). Academic performance and background characteristics among community college transfer students. *Community/Junior College Quarterly, 16,* 35-46.

John C. Calhoun State Community College. (1984). John C. Calhoun State Community College Honors Program. Decatur, AL: John C. Calhoun State Community College. ED 259 765.

Johnson, N. T. (1987). Academic factors that affect transfer student persistence. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24,* 323-329.

Keeley, E. J., and House, J. D. (1993). Transfer shock revisited: A longitudinal study of transfer academic performance. Paper presented to the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research. Chicago, IL. May 16-19, 1993.

Knoell,, D. M., and Medsker, L. L. (1965). *From junior to senior college: A national study of the transfer student.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Laanan, F. S. (1995). *Making the transition: An exploratory study of academic achievement, involvement, adjustment, and satisfaction of transfer students at UCLA.* ED 400 888.

Laanan, F. S. (1996). Making the Transition: Understanding the adjustment process of community college transfer students. *Community College Review, 23*(4), 69-84.

Laanan, F. S. (1998). Beyond Transfer Shock: A Study of Students' College Experiences and Adjustment Processes and UCLA. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles.

Lehner, M. (1984). Honors Scholar Program. Palos Hills, IL: Moraine Valley Community College. ED 242 368.

McGrath, D., and Seymour, E. (1996). Pockets of connection: Creating a sense of community at a large urban community college. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum, 7*(2), 61-73.

McMillan, J. H. (1996). *Educational research. Fundamentals for the consumer.* Second Edition. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Nolan, E. J., and Hall, D. L. (1978). Academic performance of the community college transfer student: A five-year follow-up study. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 19,* 543-548.

Norusis, M. J. (1990). SPSS Base System User's Guide. Chicago: SPSS Inc.

Oberg, K. (1960). Culture shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology, 7:* 177-182.

Olivas, M. A. (1975). A statistical portrait of honors programs in two-year colleges. Unpublished paper. ED 221 257.

Olivas, M. A. (1986). Introduction - Research on Hispanic college students: A theoretical framework and inquiry. In M. A. Olivas (Ed.), *Latino college students*, 1-25. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pace, C. R. (1979). *Measuring outcomes of college: Fifty years of findings and recommendations for the future.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Pace, C. R. (1980). Measuring the quality of student effort. *Current Issues in Higher Education, 2,* 10-16.

Pace, C. R. (1984). Measuring the quality of college student experiences. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Pace, C. R. (1990). College student experiences questionnaire. Third Edition. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Pace, C. R. (1992). College student experiences questionnaire: Norms for the third edition, 1990. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Pascarella, E., Smart, J., and Ethington, C. (1986). Long-term persistence of two-year college students. *Research in Higher Education, 24,* 47-71.

Pascarella, E., and Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students. Findings and insights from twenty-years of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Phlegar, A. G., Andrew, L. D., and McLaughlin, G. W. (1981). Explaining the academic performance of community college students who transfer to a senior institution. *Research in Higher Education, 15(2),* 99-108.

Piland, W. E., et al. (1990). Preferred learning styles and teaching strategies in the honors classroom. *Community Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice, 14*(3), 227-237.

Piland, W. E., and Azbell, J. (1984). Atypical profile: The honors program student. *Community and Junior College Journal, 54*(7), 45-47.

Richardson, R. C., Jr., and Doucette, D. S. (1980). *Persistence, performance and degree achievement of Arizona's community college transfers in Arizona's public universities.* ED 197 785.

San Diego Community College District. (1987). Honors pilot program evaluation, 1986-87. San Diego, CA: San Diego Community College District Research and Planning. ED 287 545.

Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Todd, S. M. (1988). Scholars and strategies: Honors programs in community colleges. Part II. *Community College Review, 16*(2), 24-29.

Townsend, B. K. (1993). University practices that hinder the academic success of community college transfer students. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Pittsburgh, PA. November 4-7, 1993.

Townsend, B. K. (1995). Community college transfer students: A Case Study of Survival. *The Review of Higher Education, 18*(2), 175-193.

University of California. (1995). Answers for transfers 1996-1997. Office of Student Academic Services, Office of the President. Oakland, CA: University of California.

Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (993). Where's the "culture" in cross-cultural transition? Comparative studies of sojourner adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 2*(2). 221-249.

Wilbur, S. (1996). Understanding the dynamics of community college - university collaboration: A qualitative study of a transfer admissions program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles.

Table 1
TAP Transfers and All California Community College Transfers Entering UCLA from 1989 to 1995

	TAP Quarter Transferred			
Year	Fall	Spring	All CCC[1]	% TAP
1988	98	0	Not available	Not available
1989	116	0	1,275	9.1%
1990	126	19	1,445	10.0%
1991	146	24	1,691	10.1%
1992	176	17	1,670	11.6%
1993	181	29	1,858	11.3%
1994	163	32	1,874	10.4%
1995	145	18	1,825	8.9%
Total	1,151	139	11,638	11.1%

Source: UCLA Office of Academic Planning and Budget, 1997.

Table 2
Number of TAP Transfers and All California Community College Transfers Entering UCLA from 1989 to 1995 by Declared Racial/Ethnic Background

Racial/Ethnic Background	TAP[2]	All CCC[3]	% TAP
African American	13	387	3.4%
American Indian	10	131	7.6%
Asian Pacific Islander	187	2,892	6.5%
Caucasian	734	5,417	13.5%
Chicano/Latino	103	1,733	5.9%
International	36	754	4.8%
Other	109	324	33.6%
Total	1,192	11,638	10.2%

Source: UCLA Office of Academic Planning and Budget, 1997.

[1] Includes all CCC transfers entering UCLA with sophomore or Junior standing.
[2] Includes fall 1989 to fall 1995 and spring 1990 to spring 1995.
[3] Includes all CCC transfers entering UCLA with sophomore or Junior standing from fall 1989 to fall 1995.

Table 3
Percent Distribution of TAP Transfers and All California Community College Transfers Entering UCLA from 1989 to 1995 by Declared Racial/Ethnic Background

Racial/Ethnic Background	TAP[4]	All CCC[5]
African American	1.1%	3.3%
American Indian	0.8%	1.1%
Asian Pacific Islander	15.7%	24.8%
Caucasian	61.6%	46.5%
Chicano/Latino	8.6%	14.9%
International	3.0%	6.5%
Other	9.1%	2.8%
Total[6]	99.9%	99.9%

Source: UCLA Office of Academic Planning and Budget, 1997.

Table 4
Dependent/Outcome Variable

Dimensions/Scale Item

Academic Adjustment (5 items)

- Adjusting to the academic standards or expectations at UCLA has been difficult.
- I experienced a dip in grades during the first and second semester.
- My level of stress increased when I started UCLA.
- It was difficult going from the semester to the 10-week quarter system.
- There is a sense of competition between/among students at UCLA that is not found in community colleges.

[4] Includes fall 1989 to fall 1995 and spring 1990 to spring 1995.
[5] Includes all CCC transfers entering UCLA with sophomore or Junior standing from fall 1989 to fall 1995.
[6] Percent totals do not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 5
Independent Variables

Category/Variable	Coding/Scale
Block 1: Social Demographic Variables	
Background/Pre-college Characteristics	
Age Group	Dichotomous: 0=Traditional; 1=Non-Traditional
Racial/Ethnic Identification	Dichotomous: 0=Non-White; 1=White
Sex	Dichotomous: 0=male; 1=female
Father's Level of Education	8-point scale: 1=elementary school; 8=graduate degree
Parents' Income	11-point scale: 1=less than $14,999; 11=$100,000 or more
Block 2: Community College Environment	
Community College Experiences	
Student Status	Dichotomous: 0=Non-TAP; 1=TAP
Hours spent studying/class preparation	5-point scale: 1=1 to 5 hours; 5=more than 20 hours
Hours per week doing activities (4 variables) * Socializing with friends * Talking with teachers outside of class * Student clubs/groups * Doing independent research * Volunteer work	8-point scale: 1=none; 8=over 20 hours
Community College GPA	continuous variable

Table 5 (continued)
Independent Variables

Category/Variable	Coding/Scale
Quality of Effort at Community College	
Course Learning (9 variables) Experiences with Faculty (12 variables) Clubs and Organizations (10 variables) Experience in Writing (8 variables)	Factor Items 1=never; 4=very often (see Appendix A)
College Activities at Community College	
Experiences with Courses (7 variables) Academic Counseling (7 variables) Transfer Center (4 variables) Activities prior to transferring (4 variables) Perceptions of four-year prior to transferring (4 variables)	Factor Items 1=never; 4=very often (see Appendix A)
Block 3: UCLA Environment	
UCLA Experiences	
Place of residence * Residence Hall * Fraternity or Sorority * Apartment near campus * Off campus apartment * With parents	Dichotomous: 0=no; 1=yes
Hours spent working at job at UCLA	6-point scale: 1=none; 6=more than 30 hours
Highest Degree Aspirations	6-point scale: 1=Bacherlor's; 4=Doctor
UCLA GPA (self-reported)	continuous variable
Attended Summer Transfer Orientation Attended AAP Transfer Summer Program Member of UCLA's Honors Program (L&S)	Dichotomous: 0=no; 1=yes
Involvement Activities (7 variables) * Attended academic workshops * Utilized tutorial services * Purchase lecture notes * Utilized Writing Programs * Attended student cultural events * Participate in intramural sports * Participate in recreational classes	4-point scale: 1=never; 4=very often

Table 5
Independent Variables

Category/Variable	Coding/Scale
Quality of Effort at UCLA	
Experiences with Faculty (9 variables) Clubs and Organizations (8 variables) Course Learning (8 variables) Academic Counseling (4 variables)	Factor Items 1=never; 4=very often (see Appendix A)
General Perceptions of UCLA	
Satisfaction about UCLA (4 variables) Perceptions of Faculty (4 variables) Stigma as Transfer Student (3 variables) Competition and Survival Culture (4 variables) Psychological Adjustment (4 variables)	Factor Items 1=disagree strongly; 4=agree strongly (see Appendix A)
Hours per week doing activities (8 variables) Socializing with friends Studying/homework Talking with teachers outside of class Volunteer work (or community service) Student clubs/groups Housework/childcare Commuting	8-point scale: 1=none; 8=over 20 hours
Self-Rating * Academic ability * Leadership ability * Self-Confidence (intellectual) * Self-Confidence (social) * Cooperativeness * Understanding of others	5-point scale: 1=lowest 10%; 5=highest 10%

Table 6
Reliability Coefficients of Community College and UCLA Factors

Factor Name	Description	Alpha α	# of Items
Community College Factors			
Quality of Effort			
CCFACULT	Discussions with Faculty	.92	12
CCCLUBS	Participation in clubs and organizations	.94	10
CCCRSLRN	Integration and discussion of course topics	.83	9
CCWRITE	Discussions of written work with faculty	.81	8
General Perceptions			
CCCOURSE	Courses at two-year	.89	7
CCCOUNSL	Experience with academic counselors	.88	7
CCTRNCTR	Transfer Center	.92	4
CCACTIV	Involvement activities prior to transferring	.68	4
CCPERCP	Perceptions of four-year prior to transferring	.72	4
UCLA Factors			
Quality of Effort			
UCFACULT	Discussions with faculty	.94	9
UCCLUBS	Participation in clubs and organizations	.90	8
UCCRSLRN	Integration and discussion of course topics	.82	8
UCCOUNSL	Experience with academic counselors	.67	4
General Perceptions			
UCSATIS	Overall satisfaction with UCLA	.88	4
UCFACPER	Perceptions of Faculty	.84	4
UCSTIGMA	Stigma as transfer student	.86	3
UCCOMPTE	Competition and survival culture	.66	4
Adjustment Process			
UCPSYCHO	Psychological adjustment	.75	4
UCACAADJ	Academic adjustment	.71	5
UCSOCADJ	Social Adjustment	.69	4

Table 7
Transfer Alliance Program (TAP): Transfers to UCLA by Year and Quarter
(n=351)

Community College	Year and Quarter				Total
	1994		1995		
	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	
1. Chaffey College	--	--	--	1	1
2. College of the Canyons	5	14	1	14	34
3. East Los Angeles	--	4	1	4	9
4. El Camino College	--	14	--	20	34
5. Glendale Community College	--	22	--	16	38
6. Grossmont College	--	1	--	--	1
7. Long Beach City	--	5	--	6	11
8. Los Angeles City College	--	4	--	--	4
9. Los Angeles Harbor	--	3	1	1	1
10. Los Angeles Pierce	5	31	7	21	64
11. Los Angeles Valley	6	18	2	13	39
12. Pasadena City College	--	15	1	10	26
13. San Bernardino College	--	--	--	1	1
14. Santa Monica College	15	27	3	32	77
15. West Los Angeles	--	2	1	--	3
16. West Valley College	--	3	--	1	4
TOTAL	31	163	17	140	351

-- Denotes no transfers during the respective year and quarter.

Source: UCLA Office of Academic Planning and Budget, Undergraduate Admissions Report - Transfer Registrations, 1996.

Table 8
Frequency (Percentages) of Transfer Students' Social Demographics by Student Status (N=365)

Variable	Student Status: TAP (n=76)	Student Status: Non-TAP (n=289)	Diff.*
Transfer Year			
Spring 1994	10.5	6.6	+3.9
Fall 1994	43.4	37.0	+6.4
Spring 1995	3.9	4.2	-0.3
Fall 1995	42.1	52.2	-10.1
Gender			
Percent Female	57.9	60.2	-2.3
Racial/Ethnic Identification			
African American/Black	0.0	2.8	-2.8
American Indian	0.0	0.3	-0.3
Chinese/Chinese American	7.9	10.4	-2.5
East Indian/Pakistani	1.3	1.0	+0.3
Filipino/Filipino American	3.9	2.4	+1.5
Japanese/Japanese American	2.6	4.2	-1.6
Korean/Korean American	1.3	4.8	-3.5
Mexican American/Chicano	2.6	8.0	-5.4
Other	1.3	3.5	-2.2
Other Spanish-American/Latino	2.6	6.2	-3.6
Pacific Islander	1.3	0.7	+0.6
Vietnamese/Vietnamese American	1.3	4.8	-3.5
White/Caucasian	73.7	50.9	+22.8
Percent Asian	18.3	27.3	-9.0
Percent Hispanic	5.2	14.2	-9.0
Place of Residence			
Residence Hall/Campus Housing	7.9	4.5	+3.4
Fraternity/Sorority House	1.3	0.7	+0.6
On-Campus Apartment	10.5	11.8	-1.3
Off-Campus Apartment	34.2	49.1	-14.9
With parents or relatives	43.4	29.8	+13.6

*Difference is calculated by subtracting non-TAP percentage from TAP percentage. A positive percent difference indicates a higher percentage of TAP students.

Table 8 (continued)
Frequency (Percentages) of Transfer Students' Social Demographics by Student Status (N=365)

Variable	Student Status: TAP (n=76)	Student Status: Non-TAP (n=289)	Diff.*
Parental Educational Level Father			
Elementary school or less	2.6	9.3	-6.7
Some high school	5.3	11.4	-6.1
High school graduate	11.8	16.3	-4.5
Some college	17.1	14.2	+2.9
Associate's degree from two-year	3.9	3.8	+0.1
Bachelor's degree	17.1	17.6	-0.5
Some graduate school	2.6	2.8	-0.2
Graduate degree	35.5	18.7	+16.8
Parental Educational Level Mother			
Elementary school or less	0.0	12.5	-12.5
Some high school	7.9	11.1	-3.2
High school graduate	23.7	24.2	-0.5
Some college	17.1	19.4	-2.3
Associate's degree from two-year	9.2	5.9	+3.3
Bachelor's degree	19.7	12.8	+6.9
Some graduate school	2.6	1.7	+0.9
Graduate degree	14.5	9.3	+5.2
Reported Parental Income			
Less than $14,999	6.6	19.0	-12.4
$15,000 - $24,999	10.5	9.7	+0.8
$25,000 - $39,999	11.8	22.8	-11.0
$40,000 - $59,999	15.8	15.2	+0.6
$60,000 - $74,999	13.2	8.0	+5.2
$75,000 or more	30.2	17.0	+13.2

*Difference is calculated by subtracting non-TAP percentage from TAP percentage. A positive percent difference indicates a higher percentage of TAP students.

Table 8 (continued)
Frequency (Percentages) of Transfer Students' Social Demographics by Student Status (N=365)

Variable	Student Status: TAP (n=76)	Student Status: Non-TAP (n=289)	Diff.*
High School GPA			
A or A+	25.0	13.8	+11.2
A-	19.7	15.9	+3.8
B+	23.7	21.8	+1.9
B	17.1	19.7	-2.6
B-	3.9	11.1	-7.2
C+	5.3	5.2	+0.1
C	3.9	8.0	-4.1
D	0.0	1.7	-1.7
Highest Academic Degree Planned			
Bachelor's	13.2	17.0	-3.8
Master's	21.1	38.4	-17.3
Doctorate	28.9	19.7	+9.2
Medical	14.5	10.0	+4.5
Law	15.8	13.5	+2.3
Other	5.3	0.3	+5.0
Age of Students			
Mean	24.76	25.71	-0.95

*Difference is calculated by subtracting non-TAP percentage from TAP percentage. A positive percent difference indicates a higher percentage of TAP students.

Table 9
Mean Differences in Community College Weekly Activities by Student Status
(N=365)

	Student Status			
	TAP	Non-TAP		
Activity	(n=76)	(n=289)	t	df
Volunteer work (community service)	2.48	2.05	-2.13*	107.14
	(1.62)	(1.40)		
Student clubs/groups	2.30	1.77	-3.02**	359
	(1.42)	(1.34)		
Reading for pleasure	2.43	2.80	1.99*	359
	(1.26)	(1.47)		
Doing independent research	1.47	1.76	2.25*	169.29
	(.90)	(1.30)		

M and (SD). *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Note: Responses were based on an 8-point scale (1=none; 2=less than 1 hour; 3=1-2 hours; 4=3-5 hours; 5=6-10 hours; 6=11-15 hours; 7=16-20 hours; 8=over 20 hours).

Table 10
Mean Differences on Community College Factors by Student Status
(N=365)

Factors	Student Status TAP (n=76)	Student Status Non-TAP (n=289)	t	df
General Perceptions				
Experiences with courses✞✞	20.47 (4.48)	20.58 (4.74)	.19	361
Academic counseling✞✞	23.04 (4.87)	21.41 (5.26)	-2.42*	353
Transfer Center✞✞	10.58 (4.20)	10.16 (4.05)	-.73	324
Activities prior to transferring✞✞	8.24 (2.91)	7.98 (3.20)	-.63	361
Perceptions of four-year✞✞	8.88 (3.12)	8.88 (3.11)	.01	359
Quality of Effort				
Experiences with Faculty✞	28.16 (7.99)	26.80 (8.33)	-1.27	356
Clubs and Organizations✞	19.89 (9.53)	17.16 (7.68)	-2.28*	356
Course Learning✞	28.01 (5.25)	28.75 (5.10)	1.10	361
Experience in Writing✞	25.15 (4.29)	25.59 (4.80)	.73	360

M and (SD). *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

✞ Never to Very often
✞✞ Disagree strongly to Agree strongly

Table 11
Frequency (Percentages) of Transfer Students' UCLA Experiences by Student Status (N=365)

Variable	Student Status: TAP (n=76)	Student Status: Non-TAP (n=289)	Diff.*
UCLA GPA (4th Quarter)			
Mean	3.34	3.19	+0.15
Hours Worked Per Week			
None. I didn't have a job.	25.0	23.5	+1.5
1 to 10 hours	23.7	17.3	+6.4
11 to 15 hours	9.2	17.3	-8.1
16 to 20 hours	17.1	15.2	+1.9
21 to 30 hours	19.7	14.5	+5.2
More than 30 hours	3.9	11.7	-7.8
Attended UCLA Summer Transfer Orientation			
Percent Yes	68.4	67.1	+1.3
Participated in AAP Transfer Summer Program (TSP)			
Percent Yes	3.9	9.7	-5.8
Member of Letters and Science Honors Program			
Percent Yes	30.3	8.7	+21.6
Important Reason for Attending UCLA			
To obtain a bachelor's degree	52.6	49.5	+3.1
To gain skills necessary to enter new job or occupation	3.9	11.8	-7.9
To pursue graduate or professional school	40.8	28.4	+12.4
To satisfy a personal interest (cultural, social)	2.6	9.7	-7.1

*Difference is calculated by subtracting non-TAP percentage from TAP percentage. A positive percent difference indicates a higher percentage of TAP students.

Table 11 (continued)
Frequency (Percentages) of Transfer Students' UCLA Experiences by Student Status (N=365)

Variable	Student Status: TAP (n=76)	Student Status: Non-TAP (n=289)	Diff.*
UCLA Major			
Art and Architecture	1.3	2.8	-1.5
Engineering and Applied	1.3	6.6	-5.3
Humanities	17.1	15.9	+1.2
Life Sciences	35.5	18.3	+17.2
Nursing	0.0	0.7	-0.7
Physical Sciences	2.6	9.0	-6.4
Social Sciences	40.8	44.6	-3.8
Theater Film and Television	1.3	1.4	-0.1
Undeclared	0.0	0.7	-0.7

*Difference is calculated by subtracting non-TAP percentage from TAP percentage. A positive percent difference indicates a higher percentage of TAP students.

Table 12
Mean Differences on UCLA Factors by Student Status
(N=365)

Factors	Student Status TAP (n=76)	Student Status Non-TAP (n=289)	t	df
Quality of Effort				
Experiences with Faculty✞	21.89 (7.56)	22.33 (7.50)	.45	356
Clubs and Organizations✞	15.73 (7.69)	14.17 (6.29)	-1.63	360
Course Learning✞	24.97 (4.81)	25.82 (4.67)	1.39	359
Academic Counseling✞✞	7.49 (2.12)	8.04 (2.68)	1.64	358
General Perceptions				
Satisfaction about UCLA✞✞	13.68 (2.86)	13.59 (2.80)	-.24	355
Perceptions of faculty✞✞	9.08 (3.15)	9.08 (3.21)	.00	355
Stigma as transfer student✞✞	5.79 (2.78)	5.45 (2.43)	-.02	347
Competition and survival culture✞✞	15.77 (2.36)	15.51 (2.55)	-.80	346
Adjustment				
Psychological adjustment✞✞	8.62 (2.97)	8.76 (3.05)	.36	359
Academic adjustment✞✞	14.36 (3.68)	14.80 (3.44)	.97	359
Social adjustment✞✞	9.48 (2.85)	8.98 (2.59)	-1.44	356

M and (SD). *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

✞ Never to Very often
✞✞ Disagree strongly to Agree strongly

Table 14
Predictors of Community College Students' Academic Adjustment at UCLA
(n=442)

Step	Variable	R Sqr.	Simple R	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Social Demographics														
1	Income	01	-14	-14	-15	-06	-07	-06	-05	-05	-03	-03	-03	-03	-04
2	Gender: Female	04	13	14	14	07	07	07	05	05	02	01	01	01	02
	Community College Environment														
3	Perceptions of Four-year	23	47	46	45	45	44	43	35	33	32	30	30	29	29
4	Experiences with Counselors	26	17	18	18	16	16	16	16	14	11	10	10	11	11
5	Course Learning	26	-19	-17	-17	-09	-10	-10	-11	-04	-05	-02	-03	-02	-02
	UCLA Environment														
6	Competition and Survival Culture	35	41	40	39	30	30	31	31	28	29	28	27	27	27
7	UCLA GPA	42	-38	-37	-37	-32	-31	-30	-28	-28	-26	-25	-26	-27	-26
8	Academic Counseling	44	27	26	24	20	17	17	17	14	14	13	12	12	09
9	Self-Rate: Self-Confidence (Intellectual)	45	-31	-30	-29	-19	-19	-17	-15	-11	-11	-11	-12	-11	-12
10	Hours Per Week: Studying/Homework	46	08	07	07	07	07	08	06	10	09	10	10	11	10
11	Perceptions of Faculty	47	13	13	13	07	08	07	09	09	09	09	09	09	10
12	Academic Workshops	47	17	17	17	16	15	15	14	12	09	09	08	08	08

Note: Decimals before numbers have been omitted.

A total of 43 independent variables were included in the regression equation.
A total of 31 independent variables did not enter the regression equation.

APPENDIX A
Community College Experiences

Appendix A.1

EXPERIENCES WITH GENERAL COURSES ($\alpha = .89$)	**Factor Loading**
The courses developed my critical and analytical thinking.	.68
The courses demanded intensive writing assignments and projects.	.78
Overall, the courses were intellectually challenging.	.80
The courses prepared me for the academic standards at UCLA.	.81
The courses prepared me for my major at UCLA.	.69
The course requirements were demanding.	.82
The course required extensive reading and writing.	.81

Appendix A.2

EXPERIENCES WITH COUNSELORS ($\alpha = .88$)	**Factor Loading**
Consulted with academic counselors regarding transfer.	.79
Information received from academic counselor(s) was helpful in the transfer process.	.76
Information helped me take the right courses to complete the transfer articulation agreement (IGETC).	.65
Met with academic counselors on a regular basis.	.77
Talked with a counselor/advisor about courses to take, requirements, education plans.	.84
Make an appointment with a counselor or an advisor to discuss my plans for transferring to a 4-year.	.76
Identified courses needed to meet the general education/major requirements of a 4-year I was interested in attending.	.62

Appendix A.3

TRANSFER CENTER ($\alpha = .92$)	**Factor Loading**
Utilized services of the Center.	.89
The Center was helpful in providing valuable information about transferring.	.89
The Center staff was responsive to students' needs and requests.	.85
The Center sponsored information fairs/sessions for prospective transfer students.	.83

APPENDIX A
Community College Experiences (continued)

Appendix A.4

INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES PRIOR TO TRANSFERRING ($\alpha = .68$)	**Factor Loading**
I visited the 4-year campus to learn where offices and departments were located.	.72
Spoke to academic counselors at the 4-year - transferring and major requirements.	.74
I visited the admissions office at the 4-year.	.74
I sat in on lecture classes in my major.	.62

Appendix A.5

PERCEPTIONS OF 4-YEAR PRIOR TO TRANSFERRING ($\alpha = .72$)	**Factor Loading**
I felt overwhelmed about being at a large university with thousands of students.	.85
I felt uncomfortable about being in large lecture classes.	.80
I felt insecure about making new friends at the 4-year university.	.68
I felt confident about the new challenges at the 4-year university.	.-51*

Appendix A.6

COURSE LEARNING ($\alpha = .83$)	**Factor Loading**
Took detailed notes in class	.54
Participated in class discussions.	.65
Tried to see how different facts and ideas fit together.	.79
Thought about practical applications of the material.	.76
Worked on a paper or project where I had to integrate ideas from various sources.	.64
Summarized major points and information in my readings or notes.	.65
Tried to explain the material to another student or friend.	.63
Made outlines from class notes or readings.	.49
Did additional readings on topics that were introduced and discussed in class.	.54

* Item was reverse-coded prior to scaling.

Appendix A.7

EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY ($\alpha = .92$)	Factor Loading
Visited faculty and sought their advice on class projects such as writing assignments and research papers.	.73
Felt comfortable approaching faculty outside of class.	.69
Talked with a faculty member.	.76
Asked my instructor for information related to a course I was taking (grades, make-up work, assignments)	.74
Visited informally and briefly with an instructor after class.	.80
Made an appointment to meet with a faculty member in his/her office.	.78
Discussed ideas for a term paper or class project with a faculty member.	.77
Discussed my career plans and ambitions with a faculty member.	.75
Asked an instructor for comments and criticisms about my work.	.78
Had coffee, cokes, or snacks with a faculty member.	.65
Worked with a faculty on a research project.	.47
Discussed personal problems or concerns with a faculty member.	.60

Appendix A.8

CLUBS AND ORGANIZATIONS ($\alpha = .94$)	Factor Loading
Held an office in a club, organization, or student government.	.81
Looked in the student newspaper for notices about campus events and student organizations	.68
Attended a program or event put on by a student group.	.83
Read or asked about a club, organization, or student government activity.	.83
Attended a meeting of a club, organization, or student government group.	.85
Voted in a student election.	.68
Discussed policies and issues related to campus activities and student government.	.78
Worked in some student organization or special project (publications, student govt., social event, etc.)	.84
Discussed reasons for the success or lack of success of student club meetings, activities, or events.	.85
Met with a faculty advisor or administrator to discuss the activities of a student organization	.80

Appendix A.9

EXPERIENCE IN WRITING ($\alpha = .81$)	Factor Loading
Used a dictionary or thesaurus to look up the proper meaning of words.	.52
Consciously and systematically thought about grammar, sentence structure, paragraphs, word choice, and sequence of ideas or points as I was writing.	.56
Wrote a rough draft of a paper or essay and then revised it myself before handing it in.	.72
Spent at least five hours or more writing a paper (not counting time spent in reading or at the library)	.67
Asked other people to read something I wrote to see if it was clear to them.	.60
Referred to a book or manual about style of writing, grammar, etc.	.65
Revised a paper or composition two or more times before I was satisfied with it.	.74
Asked an instructor for advice and help to improve my writing.	.54

UCLA Experiences

Appendix A.10

EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY ($\alpha = .94$)	Factor Loading
Visited faculty and sought their advice on class projects such as writing assignments and research papers	.81
Felt comfortable approaching faculty outside class.	.78
Talked with a faculty member.	.86
Asked my instructor for information related to a course I was taking (grades, make-up work, assignments, etc.)	.78
Visited informally and briefly with an instructor after class.	.79
Made an appointment to meet with a faculty member in his/her office.	.80
Discussed ideas for a term paper or other class project with a faculty member.	.80
Discussed my career plans and ambitions with a faculty member.	.73
Asked my instructor for comments and criticisms about your work.	.78

Appendix A.11

CLUBS AND ORGANIZATIONS ($\alpha = .90$)	**Factor Loading**
Held an office in a club, organization, or student government.	.72
Read or asked about a club, organization, or student government activity.	.75
Attended a meeting of a club, organization, or student government group.	.79
Voted in a student election.	.58
Discussed policies and issues related to campus activities and student government.	.73
Worked in some student organization or special project (publications, student government, social event, etc.)	.84
Discussed reasons for the success or lack of success of student club meetings, activities, or events.	.86
Met with a faculty advisor or administrator to discuss the activities of a student organization.	.77

Appendix A.12

COURSE LEARNINGS ($\alpha = .82$)	**Factor Loading**
Took detailed notes in class.	.52
Tried to see how different facts and ideas fit together.	.72
Thought about practical applications of the material.	.73
Worked on a paper or project where I had to integrate ideas from various sources.	.69
Summarized major points and information in my readings or notes.	.73
Tried to explain the material to another student or friend.	.60
Made outlines from class notes or readings.	.63
Did additional readings on topics that were introduced and discussed in class.	.58

Appendix A.13

EXPERIENCE IN ACADEMIC COUNSELING ($\alpha = .67$)	**Factor Loading**
I meet with academic counselors on a regular basis.	.82
Talked with a counselor from my major department regarding courses and major.	.71
Utilized services offered by AAP.	.51
Utilized services offered by Letters & Sciences Counseling.	.65

Appendix A.14

SATISFACTION ABOUT UCLA ($\alpha = .88$)	**Factor Loading**
I would recommend to other transfers to come to UCLA.	.87
UCLA is (was) an intellectually stimulating and often exciting place to be.	.86
If I could start over again, I would got to the same university I am now attending.	.82
I feel (felt) the courses I have taken have been interesting and worthwhile.	.79

Appendix A.15

PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY ($\alpha = .84$)	**Factor Loading**
Faculty tend to be inaccessible to students.	.87
Faculty are difficult to approach.	.81
Faculty tend to be more interested in their research than spending time with undergraduates.	.78
Professors are strongly interested in the academic development of undergraduates	.-61*

Appendix A.16

STIGMA AS TRANSFER STUDENT ($\alpha = .86$)	**Factor Loading**
Because I was a "community college transfer," most students tend to underestimate my abilities.	.88
There is a stigma at UCLA among students for having started at a community college.	.86
Because I was a "community college transfer," most faculty tend to underestimate my abilities.	.84

* Item was reverse-coded prior to scaling.

Appendix A.17

COMPETITION AND SURVIVAL CULTURE ($\alpha = .66$)	**Factor Loading**
There is a competitive nature among students at UCLA.	.74
Generally, students are more concerned about "getting the grade" instead of learning the material.	.69
Many students feel like they do not "fit in" on this campus.	.61
Most students are treated like "numbers in a book."	.58

Appendix A.18

PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT ($\alpha = .75$)	**Factor Loading**
I often feel (felt) overwhelmed by the size of the student body.	.74
The large classes intimidate me.	.77
If it difficult to find my way around campus.	.70
Upon transferring, I felt alienated at UCLA.	.54

Appendix A.19

ACADEMIC ADJUSTMENT ($\alpha = .71$)	**Factor Loading**
Adjusting to the academic standards or expectations has been difficult.	.76
I experienced a dip in grades (GPA) during the first and second quarter.	.71
My level of stress increased when I started UCLA.	.62
It was difficult going from the semester to the 10-week quarter system.	.61
There is a sense of competition between/among students at UCLA that is not found in community colleges.	.59

Appendix A.20

SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT ($\alpha = .69$)	**Factor Loading**
Adjustment to the social environment has been difficult.	.-48*
I am meeting (I've met) as many people and making as many friends as I would like at UCLA.	.82
It is (was) easy to make friends at UCLA.	.82
I am (was) very involved with social activities at UCLA.	.61

* Item was reverse-coded prior to scaling.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Beyond Transfer Shock: Dimensions of Transfer Students' Adjustment	
Author(s): Frankie Santos Laanan	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: April 24, 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

XX

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RI INFORMATION CENTE

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A relea reproduction and dissemination in electronic media for ERIC arcl subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Frankie Santos Laanan
Assistant Professor

Department of Human Resource Education
345 Education Building, MC-708
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(217) 333-0807 • *fax* (217) 244-5632
email laanan@uiuc.edu
url http://hre.ed.uiuc.edu/

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Laanan	Printed Name/Position/Title: Frankie Laanan, Assistant Professor	
Organization/Address:	Telephone: 217-333-0807	FAX: 217-244-5632
	E-Mail Address: laanan@uiuc.edu	Date: 06-05-00

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com